523394

H84

ACC No: 1405187

THE SIX
LAMBETH CONFERENCES

THE SIX
LAMBETH CONFERENCES

1867–1920

COMPILED UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE
MOST REVEREND
LORD DAVIDSON OF LAMBETH
ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY, 1903–1928

LONDON
SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING
CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE

Published in 1920
Reissue with Appendix 1929

Printed in Great Britain

R. 443.30
CARDIFF PUBLIC LIBRARIES

PREFACE

As the decennial gathering of Bishops for each Lambeth Conference has come round, I have accepted responsibility for putting forth time after time such record of the Conferences already held as should enable the Bishops of the fresh Conference to be in touch with what has gone before.

The seventh Lambeth Conference is to meet next year, and if it is to fall into sequence with the six already held, a new volume is wanted. Here it is. Of necessity it consists largely of the reproduction of what has already been published. Some parts have been published in several of the successive volumes. This volume, however, is self-contained and up to date, and ought, I think, to equip such Bishops as desire it with the necessary knowledge. It has once more, as on the last occasion, been compiled by Miss Honor Thomas, whose well-proved capacity has been again exercised. Though I shall not myself have the privilege of being a member of next year's Conference, I realise very clearly that it is likely to be even more important than any of its predecessors, and with all my heart I join in the familiar Convocation prayer :

> . . . ut Spiritus tuus, qui Concilio olim Apostolico huic nostro etiam nunc insideat ducatque nos in omnem veritatem, quae est secundum pietatem.

DAVIDSON OF LAMBETH,
Archbishop.

Chelsea,
Whitsuntide, 1929.

CONTENTS

PART I.

NARRATIVE.

CHAPTER I.

PAGE
THE FIRST CONFERENCE, 1867 3

CHAPTER II.

THE SECOND CONFERENCE, 1878 14

CHAPTER III.

THE THIRD CONFERENCE, 1888 27

CHAPTER IV.

THE FOURTH CONFERENCE, 1897 40

CHAPTER V.

THE FIFTH CONFERENCE, 1908 43

CHAPTER VI.

THE SIXTH CONFERENCE, 1920 . . . . . 46*a*

PART II.

DOCUMENTS, REPORTS, AND RESOLUTIONS, ILLUSTRATING THE HISTORY OF THE CONFERENCES.

I.

FORMAL "ADDRESS TO THE FAITHFUL" FROM THE BISHOPS ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE OF 1867 . 49

II.

PAGE

RESOLUTIONS FORMALLY PASSED BY THE CONFERENCE OF 1867 53

III.

REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEES APPOINTED BY THE CONFERENCE OF 1867—

(*a*) Synodical System 58
(*b*) Voluntary Spiritual Tribunals 62
(*c*) Courts of Metropolitans 66
(*d*) Election of Bishops 67
(*e*) Declaration of submission to Synods . . 68
(*f*) Provincial Subordination 70
(*g*) Missionary Bishoprics 71
(*h*) Condition of the Church in Natal . . . 73
(*j*) Letters Dimissory 75

IV.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE CONFERENCE ADOPTED AT THE ADJOURNED SESSION, DECEMBER 10, 1867 . . 76

V.

OFFICIAL LIST OF THE BISHOPS PRESENT AT THE CONFERENCE OF 1878 79

VI.

OFFICIAL "LETTER" OF THE BISHOPS ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE OF 1878, INCLUDING THE REPORTS—

(1) Best mode of maintaining union . . . 82
(2) Voluntary Boards of Arbitration . . . 87
(3) Missionary Bishops and Missionaries . . 89
(4) Anglican Chaplains on the Continent . . 92
(5) Answers to questions submitted during the Conference 93

VII.

OFFICIAL LIST OF THE BISHOPS PRESENT AT THE CONFERENCE OF 1888 102

VIII.

ENCYCLICAL LETTER FROM THE ASSEMBLED BISHOPS, ISSUED JULY 27, 1888 106

IX.

PAGE
RESOLUTIONS FORMALLY ADOPTED BY THE CONFERENCE OF 1888 119

X.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES, 1888—
(1) Intemperance 125
(2) Purity 130
(3) Divorce 132
(4) Polygamy 133
(5) Observance of Sunday 135
(6) Socialism 136
(7) Care of Emigrants 141
(8) Mutual Relations of Dioceses and Branches of the Anglican Communion 149
(9) Home Reunion 156
(10) Scandinavian Church, Old Catholics, etc. . 161
(11) Eastern Churches 167
(12) Authoritative Standards of Doctrine and Worship 170

XI.

OFFICIAL LIST OF THE BISHOPS PRESENT AT THE CONFERENCE OF 1897 176

XII.

ENCYCLICAL LETTER FROM THE ASSEMBLED BISHOPS, ISSUED JULY 31, 1897 182

XIII.

RESOLUTIONS FORMALLY ADOPTED BY THE CONFERENCE OF 1897 199

XIV.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES, 1897—
(1) Organisation of the Anglican Communion . 212
(2) Religious Communities 215
(3) The Critical Study of Holy Scripture . . 218
(4) Foreign Missions 222
(5) Reformation Movements on the Continent . 240
(6) Church Unity 243
(7) International Arbitration 258
(8) Industrial Problems 265
(9) The Book of Common Prayer 271
(10) Duties of the Church to the Colonies . . 276
(11) Degrees in Divinity 283

XV.

PAGE

OFFICIAL LIST OF THE BISHOPS PRESENT AT THE CONFERENCE OF 1908 287

XVI.

ENCYCLICAL LETTER FROM THE ASSEMBLED BISHOPS, ISSUED AUGUST 5, 1908 294

XVII.

RESOLUTIONS FORMALLY ADOPTED BY THE CONFERENCE OF 1908 318

XVIII.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES, 1908—

(1) The Faith and Modern Thought . . . 338
(2) Supply and Training of Clergy 347
(3) Religious Education 367
(4) Foreign Missions 372
(5) The Book of Common Prayer 382
(6) Administration of Holy Communion . . 388
(7) Ministries of Healing 390
(8) Marriage Problems 395
(9) Moral Witness of the Church 409
(10) Organisation in the Anglican Communion . 415
(11) Reunion and Intercommunion 420

XIX.

REPORT ON RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES 440

APPENDIX.

XX.

LIST OF THE BISHOPS PRESENT AT THE CONFERENCE OF 1920, ARRANGED ACCORDING TO DATE OF CONSECRATION v

XXI.

LIST OF THE BISHOPS PRESENT AT THE CONFERENCE OF 1920, ARRANGED ACCORDING TO PROVINCES . . *I*

XXII.

PAGE

ENCYCLICAL LETTER FROM THE ASSEMBLED BISHOPS, ISSUED AUGUST 7, 1920 9

XXIII.

RESOLUTIONS FORMALLY ADOPTED BY THE CONFERENCE OF 1920 25

XXIV.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES, 1920—

(1) Christianity and International Relations . 51
(2) The Church and Industrial Problems . . 59
(3) The Development of Provinces . . . 78
(4) Missionary Problems 81
(5) Position of Women 95
(6) Problems of Marriage 107
(7) Spiritualism, Christian Science, and Theosophy 116
(8) Reunion 131

INDEX

PART I

NARRATIVE

THE FIVE LAMBETH CONFERENCES

PART I

NARRATIVE

CHAPTER I

THE FIRST CONFERENCE, 1867

PERHAPS it is not too much to say that a decennial Conference of the Bishops of the Anglican Communion, under the presidency of the Archbishop of Canterbury, has now become a recognised part of the organisation of our Church, and the general attention which has been directed to the third of these Conferences seems to afford a suitable opportunity for recalling the history and doings of the earlier gatherings of 1867 and 1878.

The first official step in connection with the assembling of such a Conference was taken, not in England, but in Canada. The notion had, indeed, been "in the air" for many years,[1] both in England and abroad, and the final impulse which brought about a Conference was eminently significant of the changed conditions of the Church.

It arose, strange to say, from the interest awakened in North America by the Church affairs of South Africa.

At the Provincial Synod of the Canadian Church, held

[1] A reference to some of the earlier suggestions on the subject will be found in the *Guardian* of June 19th, 1878, p. 857.

on September 20th, 1865, it was unanimously agreed, upon the motion of the Bishop of Ontario, to urge upon the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Convocation of his Province that means should be adopted "by which the members of our Anglican Communion in all quarters of the world should have a share in the deliberations for her welfare, and be permitted to have a representation in one General Council of her members gathered from every land."[1]

To a more personal appeal which accompanied this address, Archbishop Longley replied in guarded terms. "The meeting of such a Synod," he said, "is not by any means foreign to my own feelings. . . . I cannot, however, take any step in so grave a matter without consulting my episcopal brethren in both branches of the united Church of England and Ireland, as well as those in the different colonies and dependencies of the British Empire."

In May, 1866, the Convocation of Canterbury appointed a Committee to "consider and report upon" the Canadian address, and the whole subject was fully debated in Convocation in the following spring. Obvious difficulties and dangers were suggested, but in the end the Lower House conveyed to the Archbishop of Canterbury "a respectful expression of an earnest desire that he would be pleased to issue an invitation to all the Bishops in communion with the Church of England to assemble at such time and place, and accompanied by such persons as may be deemed fit, for the purpose of Christian sympathy and mutual counsel on matters affecting the welfare of the Church at home and abroad."[2]

In the Upper House, Archbishop Longley took the utmost pains to "diminish the doubts and difficulties" of some of his brethren. "It should be distinctly understood," he said, "that at this meeting no declaration of faith shall be made, and no decision come to which shall

[1] For the full text of the address and reply, see "The Lambeth Conferences of 1867, 1878 and 1888" p. 51; and Chronicle of Convocation of Canterbury, May 2nd, 1866, p. 286; February 12th, 1867, p. 696.
[2] Chronicle of Convocation, February 14th, 1867, p. 793.

affect generally the interests of the Church, but that we shall meet together for brotherly counsel and encouragement. . . . I should refuse to convene any assembly which pretended to enact any canons or affected to make any decisions binding on the Church. . . . I feel I undertake a great responsibility in assenting to this request, and certainly if I saw anything approaching to what is apprehended as likely to result from it, I should not be disposed to sanction it, but I can assure my brethren that I should enter on this meeting in the full confidence that nothing would pass but that which tended to brotherly love and union, and would bind the Colonial Church, which is certainly in a most unsatisfactory state, more closely to the Mother Church."[1]

A week later the Archbishop issued the following invitation to all the Bishops of the Anglican Communion, then 144 in number:—

"LAMBETH PALACE,
"*February 22nd*, 1867.

"RIGHT REV. AND DEAR BROTHER,

"I request your presence at a meeting of the Bishops in visible communion with the United Church of England and Ireland, purposed (GOD willing) to be holden at Lambeth, under my presidency, on the 24th of September next and the three following days.

"The circumstances under which I have resolved to issue the present invitation are these:—The Metropolitan and Bishops of Canada, last year, addressed to the two Houses of the Convocation of Canterbury the expression of their desire that I should be moved to invite the Bishops of our Indian and Colonial Episcopate to meet myself and the Home Bishops for brotherly communion and conference.

"The consequence of that appeal has been that both Houses of the Convocation of my province have addressed

[1] Chronicle of Convocation, February 15th, 1867, p. 807.

to me their dutiful request that I would invite the attendance, not only of our Home and Colonial Bishops, but of all who are avowedly in communion with our Church. The same request was unanimously preferred to me at a numerous gathering of English, Irish, and Colonial Archbishops and Bishops recently assembled at Lambeth; at which—I rejoice to record it—we had the counsel and concurrence of an eminent Bishop of the Church in the United States of America—the Bishop of Illinois.

"Moved by these requests, and by the expressed concurrence therein of other members both of the Home and Colonial Episcopate, who could not be present at our meeting, I have now resolved—not, I humbly trust, without the guidance of GOD the Holy Ghost—to grant this grave request, and call together the meeting thus earnestly desired. I greatly hope that you may be able to attend it, and to aid us with your presence and brotherly counsel thereat.

"I propose that, at our assembling, we should first solemnly seek the blessing of Almighty GOD on our gathering, by uniting together in the highest act of the Church's worship. After this, brotherly consultations will follow. In these we may consider together many practical questions, the settlement of which would tend to the advancement of the Kingdom of our Lord and Master Jesus Christ, and to the maintenance of greater union in our missionary work, and to increased intercommunion among ourselves.

"Such a meeting would not be competent to make declarations or lay down definitions on points of doctrine. But united worship and common counsels would greatly tend to maintain practically the unity of the faith: whilst they would bind us in straiter bonds of peace and brotherly charity.

"I shall gladly receive from you a list of any subjects you may wish to suggest to me for consideration and discussion. Should you be unable to attend, and desire to commission any brother Bishop to speak for you, I shall

welcome him as your representative in our united deliberations.

"But I must once more express my earnest hope that, on this solemn occasion, I may have the great advantage of your personal presence.

"And now I commend this proposed meeting to your fervent prayers; and, humbly beseeching the blessing of Almighty GOD on yourself and your diocese, I subscribe myself,

"Your faithful brother in the Lord,

"C. T. CANTUAR."

The invitation was accepted by 76 Bishops, and as soon as those who came from the Colonies and the United States began to arrive in England, a series of preliminary meetings was held to discuss and arrange the details of a Conference for which no precedent existed to serve as a guide. The strong divergence of opinion upon the legal aspect of Bishop Colenso's deposition and excommunication, and the fact that the Bishop of Capetown had come to England on purpose to secure, if possible, the synodical sanction of the Conference to the course he had himself adopted, made the agenda-paper a matter of no small difficulty, if it was to be kept within the limits laid down by the Archbishop of Canterbury in the Convocation speech which has been quoted above. Not a few of the English Bishops felt so sure of the increased confusion such a Conference must cause in an already tangled web that they declined to attend its deliberations. Among these were the Archbishop of York and the Bishops of Durham, Carlisle, Ripon, Peterborough, and Manchester. Others, including Bishop Thirlwall, of St. David's, postponed their acceptance until the official agenda-paper or programme should be published,[1] a fact to which they afterwards called attention when the programme had unexpectedly been changed.

[1] See "The Lambeth Conferences," p. 56.

The Conference met on Tuesday, September 24th, the opening service being preceded by a Celebration of Holy Communion in Lambeth Palace Chapel, with a sermon from Bishop Whitehouse of Illinois.[1] The meetings of the Conference were held in the upstairs dining-hall, or "Guard-Room," of Lambeth Palace, not (as was the case in 1878) in the great library. On the Archbishop of Canterbury's right sat the Archbishop of Armagh, the Bishop of London, the Presiding Bishop of the American Church, the Primus of the Scottish Episcopal Church, the Bishop of Calcutta and the Bishop of Sydney. On the left were the Archbishop of Dublin, and the Bishops of Montreal, New Zealand and Capetown. The other Bishops sat in front. The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol[2] acted as episcopal secretary to the meeting throughout its deliberations.

In his opening address,[3] Archbishop Longley again defined, with some care, the position of the Conference. "It has never been contemplated," he said, "that we should assume the functions of a general synod of all the Churches in full communion with the Church of England, and take upon ourselves to enact canons that should be binding upon those here represented. We merely propose to discuss matters of practical interest, and pronounce what we deem expedient in resolutions which may serve as safe guides to future action. Thus it will be seen that our first essay is rather tentative and experimental, in a matter in which we have no distinct precedent to direct us."

Special importance attached to the discussions of the first day, when, in the form of a preamble to the subsequent resolutions, the standpoint taken by the Anglican Church was in general terms described. All the leading Bishops took part in the debate, and its outcome will be best seen by placing the paragraph, as it was first drafted, side by side with the form which was finally agreed upon.

[1] See "The Lambeth Conferences," p. 61.
[2] Right Rev. C. J. Ellicott, D.D.
[3] See "The Lambeth Conferences," p. 77.

As originally drafted.

"We, Bishops of Christ's Holy Catholic Church, professing the faith of the primitive and undivided Church, as based on Scripture, defined by the first four General Councils,[1] and reaffirmed by the Fathers of the English Reformation, now assembled by the good providence of GOD at the Archiepiscopal Palace of Lambeth, under the presidency of the Primate of all England, desire, first, to give hearty thanks to Almighty GOD for having thus brought us together for common counsels and united worship; secondly, we desire to express the deep sorrow with which we view the divided condition of the flock of Christ throughout the world; and lastly, we do here solemnly declare our belief that the best hope of future re-union will be found in drawing each of us for ourselves closer to our common Lord, in giving ourselves to much prayer and intercession, in the cultivation of a spirit of charity, and in seeking to diffuse through every part of the Christian community that desire and resolution to return to the faith and discipline of the undivided Church which was the principle of the English Reformation."

As ultimately carried.

"We, Bishops of Christ's Holy Catholic Church, in visible Communion with the United Church of England and Ireland, professing the faith delivered to us in Holy Scripture, maintained by the primitive Church and by the Fathers of the English Reformation, now assembled by the good providence of GOD, at the Archiepiscopal Palace of Lambeth, under the presidency of the Primate of all England, desire, first, to give hearty thanks to Almighty GOD for having thus brought us together for common counsels and worship; secondly, we desire to express the deep sorrow with which we view the divided condition of the flock of Christ throughout the world, ardently longing for the fulfilment of the prayer of our Lord: 'That all may be one, as Thou, Father, art in me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent me'; and, lastly, we do here solemnly record our conviction that unity will be most effectually promoted, by maintaining the faith in its purity and integrity, as taught in the Holy Scriptures, held by the primitive Church, summed up in the Creeds, and affirmed by the undisputed General Councils, and by drawing each of us closer to our common Lord, by giving ourselves to much prayer and intercession, by the cultivation of a spirit of charity, and a love of the Lord's appearing."

On the second day—Wednesday, September 25th—the President consented, notwithstanding the strenuous protest of several Bishops, to a complete change of programme, in accordance with the wish of the Bishop of Capetown and others,[2] and the discussions were thus diverted into an unexpected channel. A long day was

[1] See I. Eliz., c. i., xxxvi.
[2] See "The Lambeth Conferences," p. 83.

occupied in discussing the due gradation of synodal authority, diocesan, provincial, and perhaps patriarchal, within the Anglican Communion. After the failure of successive attempts to obtain the formal sanction of the Conference to the definite schemes proposed, it was found necessary to fall back upon a perfectly general resolution proposed by Bishop Selwyn, of New Zealand, in the following terms: "That, in the opinion of this Conference, unity of faith and discipline will be best maintained among the several branches of the Anglican Communion by due and canonical subordination of the synods of the several branches to the higher authority of a synod or synods above them."

This was carried *nem. con.*, and a Committee was appointed to consider the whole subject.[1]

On the following day (Thursday, September 26th), the "burning question" of Bishop Colenso's position was the subject of prolonged debate. The Archbishop of Canterbury had declined to allow any distinct resolution of condemnation to be put to the Conference, and he ruled out of order a motion to that effect which was proposed by the Presiding Bishop of the American Church. After several hours' discussion it was resolved, by 49 votes to 10, "that in the judgment of the Bishops here assembled, the whole Anglican Communion is deeply injured by the present condition of the Church in Natal; and that a Committee be now appointed at this general meeting to report on the best mode by which the Church may be delivered from the continuance of this scandal, and the truth maintained. That such report be forwarded to his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, with the request that his Grace will be pleased to transmit the same to all the Bishops of the Anglican Communion, and to ask for their judgment thereon."[2]

The next matter dealt with was the possible constitution of what was described as a Spiritual Court of Appeal; and on this subject it was found necessary, after long debate, to await the report of a Committee before any formal

[1] See p. 58. [2] See page 73.

recommendation could be made. Such a Committee was accordingly appointed "to consider the constitution of a voluntary, spiritual tribunal, to which questions of doctrine may be carried by appeal from the tribunals for the exercise of discipline in each Province of the Colonial Church." [1]

It had, upon the previous day, been informally decided that a short "Encyclical" Letter or Address should be drafted by a Committee [2] for the signature of the Bishops attending the Conference. This Address was adopted by the whole body before the adjournment on Thursday evening, and was formally signed at the morning session on the following day.[3] It was suggested in the Conference that it should be publicly read by the Archbishop from the altar of Lambeth Parish Church; but this course was not adopted. After other resolutions [4] had been carried with respect to the due notification of the establishment of new dioceses, the provision of Letters Commendatory, and the proper measure of publicity to be given to the proceedings of the Conference, a second and unexpected debate arose upon the position of Bishop Colenso, and a resolution was carried expressing the acquiescence of the Conference in certain advice given by the Convocation of Canterbury a year before, respecting the steps to be taken "if it be decided that a new Bishop should be consecrated" for the Diocese of Natal.[5]

After the *Gloria in Excelsis* had been sung by the assembled Bishops, the Primate dismissed the Conference with the Benediction, on the understanding that those members of it who could remain in England should reassemble in December to receive the reports of the various Committees.

On the following day, Saturday, September 28th, 34 Bishops attended a closing service in Lambeth Parish Church, when the Holy Communion was celebrated by the

[1] See page 62.

[2] The Committee consisted of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Bishops of London, Winchester, Oxford, North Carolina, Grahamstown, Ohio, Ely, St. Andrews, Capetown, Moray and Ross, and New Zealand.

[3] See p. 49. [4] See p. 53. [5] See page 55.

Archbishop, and a sermon was preached by Bishop Fulford, of Montreal. It had originally been proposed that this service should be held in Westminster Abbey; but Dean Stanley, in a correspondence published at the time,[1] gave his reasons for objecting to the use of the Abbey in the manner proposed, and the Conference fell back on Lambeth Church as an alternative.

The several Committees were in frequent session during the next two months under the direction of Bishop Selwyn of New Zealand,[2] Bishop Fulford of Montreal, and Bishop Cotterill of Grahamstown, the last-named of whom had undertaken the onerous work of "Secretary of Committees" to the Conference.

On December 10th a further session of the Conference, or such members of it as had remained in England, was held at Lambeth Palace, when eight Reports were presented.[3] With reference to the first seven of these, a resolution was in each case formally passed: "That this adjourned meeting of the Conference receives the Report (No. —) of the Committee now presented, and directs the publication thereof, commending it to the careful consideration of the Bishops of the Anglican Communion, as containing the result of the deliberations of that Committee; and returns the members of the same its thanks for the care with which they have considered the various important questions referred to them."

Upon the presentation of Report No. VIII., which referred to Bishop Colenso's deposition, it was resolved "that the Report be received and printed; that the thanks of this meeting be given to the Committee for their labours, and that his Grace be requested to communicate the Report to the Council of the Colonial Bishoprics Fund."[4]

The further resolutions, which will be found in full on page 76, were for the most part of a formal character. It was, indeed, impossible, considering the small number of

[1] See "The Lambeth Conferences," p. 101.
[2] Bishop Selwyn had been nominated in November, 1867, to the See of Lichfield, but was not enthroned till January 9th, 1868.
[3] See p. 58. [4] See p. 73.

Bishops who were able to attend, that any important motions should at this stage be brought before them. The session lasted for a few hours only, and it became evident that in any future Conference some different arrangement must be adopted. Reiterated thanks were expressed to the Bishops of Gloucester and Grahamstown, the Episcopal Secretaries; and to Mr. Philip Wright and Mr. Isambard Brunel, who had acted as their lay assistants and advisers. The Conference had been attended, in all, by 76 Bishops out of 144 who had received invitations. Of these 76, 18 were English Bishops, 5 were Irish, and 6 were Scotch. The Colonial Church sent 24, including 5 Metropolitans. The United States sent 19. At no one session of the Conference were all the Bishops present, but the Encyclical Address received the signatures of all, and the President was subsequently authorised to affix the names of several others who had been reluctantly prevented from attending.[1]

[1] See p. 77.

CHAPTER II

THE SECOND CONFERENCE, 1878

THE circumstances in which the first Conference had been held were exceptionally difficult, and some of the interests at stake were of so keen and even personal a sort that the Bishops found it hard to give undistracted attention to the wider questions of policy and practice which had been included in Archbishop Longley's programme. The allotted time also had been far too short for dealing adequately with such subjects. Eight Committees had indeed reported; but their Reports, as has been seen, were presented to less than a score of Bishops at one brief session on a single day. Due discussion of them was thus impossible, and Bishop Selwyn, who had been foremost perhaps among the promoters of the gathering, could only suggest the postponement to a future Conference of any debate upon these weighty documents.[1]

The inquiry soon became common. Will there be a second Conference, and if so, when? Once again, as in 1865, it was the Canadian Church which took the first official step. In December, 1872, the Bishops of the Ecclesiastical Province of Canada made formal appeal to the Convocation of Canterbury to join with them in a request to Archbishop Tait, who had in 1868 succeeded to the Primacy, that he would summon as soon as possible a second meeting of the Conference.[2]

Taking this Canadian letter as his text, Bishop Selwyn,

[1] See *e.g.* Chronicle of Convocation, February 13th, 1873, p. 172.
[2] See "The Lambeth Conferences," p. 139.

in a memorable speech in Convocation, endorsed and expanded the appeal. He had visited America in 1871. He was to pay a second and more formal visit in 1874, and his experience in every part of the world led him to long for such confederation and unity of action as could, he believed, be best secured by a second Conference, or, as he called it, "A General Council of the Bishops of the Anglican Communion, to carry on the work begun by the Lambeth Conference of 1867."[1]

The matter was, by common consent, adjourned for a time; and in the following year (1874) Bishop Kerfoot of Pittsburgh, as representing the American Church, was in constant communication upon the subject with Archbishop Tait, whom he visited at Addington, and to whom he was authorised to write officially from America.[2] The Bishop of Lichfield's formal attendance in that year at the meetings, first of the Provincial Synod of Canada and then of the General Convention in New York,[3] brought the question again into prominence, and it had now become practically certain that a second Conference would be held in 1877 or 1878 if the necessary conditions could be agreed upon.

Some of these conditions were suggested by the Canadian House of Bishops[4]; others were laid down by the Archbishop himself in an important Convocation speech, and in his written reply to a formal request signed by no less than 42 Bishops of the American Church.[5] Speaking in Convocation on April 16th, 1875, he said:—

"No one can doubt that very great good has arisen from the friendly intercourse which took place during the last Lambeth Conference. At the same time it must be remembered that it is a serious matter to gather the Bishops together from all parts of the globe, unless there is some distinct object for their so gathering. I therefore am

[1] See Chronicle of Convocation, February 13th, 1873, pp. 168–174.
[2] See "The Lambeth Conferences," p. 141, and "Life of Bishop Kerfoot," vol. ii., pp. 581–587.
[3] See "Life of Bishop Selwyn," vol. ii., pp. 319–324.
[4] See "The Lambeth Conferences," p. 148.
[5] See "The Lambeth Conferences," p. 144.

disposed, by the advice of my brethren, to request that our brethren at home, and also those at a distance, will state to me as explicitly as possible what the subjects are that it is desirable to discuss at such meeting. They are of a somewhat limited character. There is no intention whatever on the part of anybody to gather together the Bishops of the Anglican Church for the sake of defining any matter of doctrine. Our doctrines are contained in our formularies, and our formularies are interpreted by the proper judicial authorities, and there is no intention whatever at any such gathering that questions of doctrine should be submitted for interpretation in any future Lambeth Conference any more than they were at the previous Lambeth Conference. My predecessor had a very difficult task in defining the exact duty of the Bishops who came together on the former occasion, and with great firmness, and at the same time with that remarkable courtesy and kindliness for which he was so eminent, he steered the somewhat difficult course which was before him, and it was distinctly settled that matters of that kind were not to be entered upon. Well, then, with regard to discipline, of course our discipline is exercised by ourselves and by the constituted Courts of the Church at home, and the discipline of the various Colonial and more independent Churches is exercised by these Churches according to fixed rules which have been established by themselves, and we have no intention whatever of interfering with these matters of discipline. We are, therefore, perhaps naturally, anxious to know tolerably distinctly the subjects which any would wish to bring before us. . . . Friendly intercourse must, of course, be of great value. But it is possible that Bishops at a very great distance—such as the Bishop of Athabasca, who, I believe, can scarcely reach his diocese under a year—might perhaps, under a misapprehension, think it was necessarily their duty to come to such a Conference unless it was distinctly stated what was to be done. . . . I cannot doubt that there are many points respecting the connection between the Mother Church and the Colonial Churches on

which a friendly Conference would be very valuable indeed. . . . With regard to our brethren in America, no such difficulties exist: what we enjoyed so much during the late Conference was the friendly intercourse and exchange of sentiment between us and them. We have no desire to interfere with their affairs, and I am sure they have no desire to interfere with ours. As far as they are concerned, I think it would be a work of love in which we should be engaged—the extension of Christ's kingdom—and that we may be able by friendly intercourse to strengthen each other's hands. But I think it important that there should be no misunderstanding, and none of that difficulty which, I am bound to say, did exist at the last Lambeth Conference as to what subjects might and what subjects might not be introduced; that we should know what it is that our brethren wish to bring before us, and what we wish to bring before them, before they give themselves the trouble of coming from the ends of the earth, happy as the results of such a meeting are, under GOD's Providence, likely to be." [1]

Fortified by the concurrence of the Northern Convocation,[2] which had held aloof in 1867, the Archbishop of Canterbury issued a formal letter on March 28th, 1876, to all the Bishops of the Anglican Communion, intimating his readiness to hold a Conference in 1878, "if it shall seem expedient after the opinions of all our brethren have been ascertained," and inviting an expression of opinion.[3] These letters to the Bishops throughout the world were not, as heretofore, sent direct from Lambeth, but were forwarded to the various Metropolitans and Presiding Bishops, with a request that they would transmit them officially to the Bishops entitled to receive them in each branch or province of the Church—a rule which has since been followed in all similar circulars of an official kind.

Before the close of the year about 90 letters of reply

[1] See Chronicle of Convocation, April 16th, 1875, pp. 132–134.
[2] For formal resolution passed in the Convocation of York on February 26th, 1875, see "The Lambeth Conferences," p. 150.
[3] See "The Lambeth Conferences," p. 151.

were received by the Archbishop, from all parts of the world, showing, as had been anticipated, an overwhelming preponderance of opinion in favour of a second Conference, provided a longer period of session could be arranged for than "the four short days" of 1867.

Most of the Bishops also suggested subjects for discussion, and on these the Archbishop took counsel with an Episcopal Committee, and especially with Bishop Selwyn. After the fullest deliberation, the following definite invitation was issued:—

LAMBETH PALACE,
July 10th, 1877.

"RIGHT REVEREND AND DEAR BROTHER,

"It is proposed to hold a Conference of Bishops of the Anglican Communion, at this place, beginning on Tuesday, the second day of July, 1878.

"The Conference, it is proposed, shall extend over four weeks; the first week, of Four Sessions, to be devoted to discussions, in Conference, of the subjects submitted for deliberation; the second and third weeks to the consideration of these subjects in Committees; and the fourth week to final discussions in Conference, and to the close of the meeting.

"The subjects selected for discussion are the following:—

"(1) The best mode of maintaining Union among the various churches of the Anglican Communion.

"(2) Voluntary Boards of Arbitration for Churches to which such an arrangement may be applicable.

"(3) The relations to each other of Missionary Bishops and of Missionaries, in various branches of the Anglican Communion acting in the same country.

"(4) The position of Anglican Chaplains and Chaplaincies on the Continent of Europe and elsewhere.

"(5) Modern forms of infidelity, and the best means of dealing with them.

"(6) The condition, progress, and needs of the various Churches of the Anglican Communion.

"I shall feel greatly obliged if, at your early convenience, you will inform me whether we may have the pleasure of expecting your presence at the Conference.

"I am,

"Right Reverend and dear Brother,

"Yours faithfully in Christ,

"A. C. CANTUAR."

It was evidently not without intention that the subjects selected for discussion, though grouped under such all-embracing headings, coincided in some parts so closely with the Resolutions of the Conference of 1867. The Reports presented in that year had never, as has been seen, received adequate discussion, nor had any one of them been "adopted" by the Conference. By a recurrence to these subjects a certain measure of continuity was secured, and a basis was laid for the practical deliberations of 1878. The plan adopted in 1867 of drafting and publishing beforehand the Resolutions which were to be moved had not worked altogether well, and it was arranged that in 1878 the formal motion should in each case be for the appointment of a Committee which, after considering some branch of the selected subjects, should report to the Conference in its final week of session.

108 Bishops accepted the Archbishop's invitation. Some of these, however, were at the last moment prevented from attending, and the actual number present at the Conference was exactly 100.[1]

On Saturday, June 29th, St. Peter's Day, the proceedings of the Conference began with a gathering of Bishops at Canterbury, for what has been described as a "Service of Welcome" in the Cathedral.

Archbishop Tait, four weeks before, had lost his only

[1] See p. 79.

son, who had recently returned from a visit to America, and the fear that the Archbishop would himself be unable to attend the Service, which would thus be deprived of much of its interest and completeness, kept away many Bishops who had intended to be present.

The Archbishop, however, went to Canterbury as arranged, and was met by 36 Bishops[1] and an immense gathering of clergy.

A service was held in the morning in St. Augustine's Missionary College, with a sermon by Bishop Cleveland Coxe, of Western New York, and at the Special Evensong in the Cathedral at 3 o'clock, the Archbishop gave an official welcome to the assembled Bishops. The ancient marble throne, known as "St. Augustine's Chair," was moved from its ordinary position in the south transept and placed in the centre of the altar steps. The Bishops were grouped on either side of it, and the Archbishop addressed them as follows:—

"My brothers, representatives of the Church throughout the world, engaged in spreading the Gospel of Jesus Christ wherever the sun shines, I esteem it a very high privilege to welcome you here to-day, to the cradle of Anglo-Saxon Christianity. . . . I am addressing you from St. Augustine's Chair. This thought carries us back to the time when that first missionary to our Anglo-Saxon forefathers, amid much discouragement, landed on these barbarous shores. More than twelve centuries and a half have rolled on since then. The seed he sowed has borne an abundant harvest, and this great British nation, and our sister beyond the ocean, have cause to render thanks to GOD for the work begun by him here. And how full of encouragement to you is St. Augustine's work. What difficulties greater than those that confronted him can stand in your path? And you have blessings that he had not. You stand nearer the pure primitive Christianity of the Apostles. You have a motive power to touch the heart

[1] Nearly all of these came from abroad. Only three of the home Diocesans were present.

denied to him. . . . The varied history of the Church has recorded many failures and many successes, and we learn from the past neither to be elated by the one nor discouraged by the other. The monuments which surround us speak of a chequered history. They tell of dark times and of great times. But they all testify to the superintending power of GOD, Who works all things according to the pleasure of His will, after His own plan for the building up of His one Kingdom in His own way. . . . It is my privilege to welcome you to Christ Church, Canterbury. . . . Gregory sent St. Augustine here that he might mark England with the name of Christ, 'that Name which is above every name.' GOD grant that that Name may be ever more and more acknowledged among us; that its glories may shine more and more brightly here, and in your distant dioceses, triumphing over all obstacles, and reconciling all petty divisions, uniting all hearts in the truth of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. My Brethren from across the Atlantic—you especially from the great Republic—to you a particular welcome is due from me. Partly for our Church's sake, partly for my sake, partly also for something you discerned in himself, you welcomed one very dear to me last autumn.[1] The bond that unites us is not the less sacred because so many hopes of earthly joy have withered and disappeared. GOD unite us all more closely in His own great Family. And now let us to prayer."

At 11 o'clock on Tuesday, July 2nd, the Bishops met at Lambeth. They were marshalled in the Guard-Room, where the actual Sessions of 1867 had been held, and passed thence in procession to the Chapel, the Bishops from the United States walking alongside of the English Diocesan Bishops as their guests, all due precedence being given in the processional arrangements to the Metropolitans and Presiding Bishops.[2] After the *Veni Creator* had been sung, the Holy Communion was celebrated by the Arch-

[1] The Archbishop's son, the Rev. Craufurd Tait, had been formally welcomed by the House of Bishops assembled at Boston on October 5th, 1877.

[2] See "The Lambeth Conferences," p. 206.

bishop of Canterbury, assisted by the Bishops of London, Winchester, Salisbury and Rochester, as officers of the Provincial College. With the exception of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Chaplains,[1] none but Bishops were present in the Chapel. The sermon was preached by the Archbishop of York, the text being Galatians ii. 11 : " But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed."[2]

The Sessions of the Conference were held in the Great Library. The arrangement of hours and subjects was as follows :—

Tuesday, July 2nd.	11 a.m.—Holy Communion and sermon in Lambeth Palace Chapel. 1.30 p.m.—Archbishop's opening address. 2 p.m.–4.45 p.m.—*Subject I.:* The best mode of maintaining union among the various Churches of the Anglican Communion.
Wednesday, July 3rd.	10.30 a.m.—Litany in Chapel. 11 a.m.—*Subject II.:* Voluntary Boards of Arbitration for Churches to which such an arrangement may be applicable. 1.30 p.m.—*Subject III.:* The relation to each other of Missionary Bishops and of Missionaries in various Branches of the Anglican Communion, acting in the same country.
Thursday, July 4th.	10.30 a.m.—Litany in Chapel. 11 a.m.—*Subject IV.:* The position of Anglican Chaplains and Chaplaincies on the Continent of Europe and elsewhere. 1.30 p.m.—*Subject V.:* Modern forms of Infidelity, and the best means of dealing with them.

[1] Archdeacon Fisher, Rev. F. G. Blomfield, Hon. and Rev. W. H Fremantle, Rev. W. F. Erskine Knollys, Rev. Randall T. Davidson.
[2] See " The Lambeth Conferences," p. 154.

Friday, July 5th.	10.30 a.m.—Litany in Chapel. 11 a.m. and 1.30 p.m.—*Subject VI.*: The condition, progress, and needs of the various Churches of the Anglican Communion.

It was decided, almost unanimously, that the proceedings of the Conference should, as in 1867, be private. A shorthand report was made of all the speeches, and it was arranged that this should be preserved by the Archbishop along with the other manuscripts belonging to Lambeth Library, but should in no way be made public.[1]

The secretarial work of the Conference was again, as in 1867, under the charge of Bishops Ellicott and Cotterill,[2] assisted by Dr. Isambard Brunel, and, unofficially, by the Archbishop's resident Chaplain.[3] For the avoidance of discussions irrelevant to the programme, it was arranged, with general consent, that if any memorials or petitions—and there were not a few—should be forwarded to the Conference, they should be placed, without further remark than a bare statement of their purport, in the hands of the President, and that the memorialists should be informed that in no case could any answer be returned.

In the opening debates during the first week the formal motion was in each case for the appointment of a Committee to consider the particular subject under discussion, and to report to the Conference during the closing week of Session. On the final and very wide subject—(No. VI.: The condition, progress, and needs of the various Churches of the Anglican Communion)—the order was varied by the appointment of an influential Committee presided over by the Archbishop of Canterbury, which sat *de die in diem* at

[1] A long account of the debates which had taken place in 1867 was unexpectedly published in the *Guardian* of June 19th, 1878, in circumstances explained in a letter from the Rev. W. Benham to the Archbishop, which appeared in the *Guardian* of the following week, June 26th, 1878, p. 900.

[2] Bishop of Grahamstown, 1856–1871; Bishop of Edinburgh, 1871–1886.

[3] Rev. R. T. Davidson.

Lambeth, "to receive questions submitted in writing by Bishops desiring the advice of the Conference on difficulties or problems they have met with in their several Dioceses." [1]

The various Committees met at Lambeth, Fulham, Farnham and elsewhere during the fortnight which intervened between the first and last groups of Sessions, and their Reports were, for the most part, ready when the Conference re-assembled in Lambeth Library on Monday, July 22nd. On Subject No. V. alone—(Modern forms of Infidelity, and the best means of dealing with them)—the Committee, as was natural, announced that they had not found it possible to prepare in the time allotted for their deliberations a detailed Report upon so vast a question. To judge, however, from the published opinions of the Bishops present at the Conference,[2] the debates upon this subject were among the most useful of any that took place.

As the outcome of much discussion it was decided that the Reports, when adopted by the Conference, should be incorporated as a whole in a combined "Letter," [3] and put forth to the world in the name of the hundred Bishops assembled. This course was rendered possible by the almost complete unanimity with which the five Reports in their ultimate shape received the imprimatur of the Conference. Bishop Wordsworth of Lincoln, who, as Archdeacon of Westminster, had in 1867 translated into Greek and Latin the Address then published,[4] undertook in like manner to make translations of this document of 1878, condensing or omitting such portions of the Reports as would be inappropriate or uninteresting to those outside the Anglican Communion.[5]

The Letter having been thus formally signed, the *Gloria in Excelsis* was sung by the assembled Bishops, the Bene-

[1] See p. 93.
[2] See for example, "The Second Lambeth Conference: A Personal Narrative," by Bishop Stevens Perry, of Iowa, pp. 27 *et seq.*
[3] See p. 82.
[4] See "The Lambeth Conferences," p. 92.
[5] See "The Lambeth Conferences," p. 191.

diction was pronounced, and the deliberations of the Conference were at an end.

On the following day (Saturday, July 27th) a grand closing service was held in St. Paul's Cathedral. The Bishops who were able to be present—about 85 in number—received the Archbishop of Canterbury at the West door, and the hymn, "The Church's One Foundation," was sung as the long procession walked up the nave. The *Te Deum* [1] followed, and the Holy Communion was then celebrated by the Archbishop of Canterbury, who was assisted in the service and administration by the Bishops of London, Moray and Ross, Sydney, Montreal, Christ Church (New Zealand), Capetown, Rupertsland and Delaware. The sermon was preached by Bishop Stevens, of Pennsylvania, from the text, "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Me" (St. John, xii. 32).[2] The service over, the Bishops assembled in the apse of the Cathedral, when a few farewell words were spoken by the Archbishop. "I feel confident," he said, "that the effect of our gathering will be that the Church at home and abroad will be strengthened by the mutual counsel which we have taken together. May the blessing of Almighty GOD, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost attend each one of us in our several spheres when we depart from this place. On behalf of the Bishops of England I offer to those of our brethren who have come hither from foreign lands our heartfelt thanks, and bid them, in the name of GOD, Farewell!"

So ended the second Lambeth Conference. It had been attended, as has been seen, by exactly 100 Bishops. Thirty-five of these were English,[3] 9 were Irish, 7 were Scottish, 30 were Colonial and Missionary, and 19 belonged to the Church of the United States.[4] The expenses of the Conference, so far as they did not devolve upon the Arch-

[1] Stainer in E flat.
[2] See "The Lambeth Conferences," p. 208.
[3] Namely, 2 Archbishops, 26 English Diocesans, 3 Bishops Suffragan, and four ex-Colonial Bishops holding "Commissions" in England (see p. 79).
[4] For numbers attending the 1867 Conference, see above p. 13.

bishop of Canterbury, were defrayed by the English Diocesan Bishops. A Committee of laymen, under the guidance of Mr. J. G. Talbot, M.P., undertook to arrange for all possible hospitality to the American and Colonial Bishops. This organisation, however, as well as the visits paid to the English Universities and Cathedral cities, lay altogether outside the official arrangements for the Conference.

CHAPTER III

THE THIRD CONFERENCE, 1888

It was virtually settled at the Conference of 1878 that a third Conference should be held at Lambeth, ten years later, and the death of Archbishop Tait, on December 3rd, 1882, made no difference in these arrangements.

In July, 1886, Archbishop Benson issued the following formal letter, which was sent, as on previous occasions, through the various Metropolitans and Presiding Bishops, to all members of the Anglican Episcopate "exercising superintendence over Dioceses, or lawfully commissioned to exercise Episcopal functions therein": —

"Right Reverend and Dear Brother,

"There appears to be a general desire that a Conference of the Bishops of the Anglican Communion should again be held at Lambeth within the next few years.

"I have accordingly decided (following the precedents of 1867 and 1878) to issue next year an invitation to such a Conference, which would assemble, according to our present plan, in the summer of 1888.

"It will be of material assistance to myself and to those who are good enough to co-operate with me in making the necessary arrangements, if you can, at your early convenience, inform me whether it seems to you probable that you will be able to take part in our deliberations, and whether there are any subjects of general importance which

appear to you specially appropriate for discussion in the Conference.

"I am in hopes that the suggestions which may reach me in answer to this circular letter will enable me to issue, next spring, the formal invitations to the Conference, together with an intimation as to the definite subjects which will, in the following year, come before us for discussion.

"I have made these preliminary arrangements in conjunction with the Archbishop of York and the English Bishops, and I am glad to be able to inform you that the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, whose efficient aid as hon. Episcopal Secretary, both in 1867 and 1878, will be gratefully remembered, has again kindly consented to act in that capacity. We have associated with him as hon. Assistant Secretary the Dean of Windsor, who, as resident Chaplain to Archbishop Tait, was responsible for many of the arrangements of the Conference of 1878.

"It is not necessary that I should assure you of our earnest desire that you will unite with us in humble prayer to Almighty God that His guidance and blessing may be vouchsafed in rich measure, both to our ultimate deliberations and to the arrangements necessary to secure their efficiency.

"I remain,

"Your faithful Brother and Servant in Christ,

"Edw: Cantuar:"

In the twenty years that had elapsed since the first Conference, the number of Bishops entitled to receive an invitation had increased from 144 to 200, and nine more were added before the third Conference actually assembled. Most of the Bishops, in replying, suggested subjects for discussion, and these suggestions were examined with the utmost care by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and by the other Bishops whose assistance he invited. The result of this examination was the following formal letter, sent through the Metropolitans as before:—

LAMBETH PALACE,
9th November, 1887.

"RIGHT REVEREND AND DEAR BROTHER,

"I am now able to send you definite information with regard to the Conference of Bishops of the Anglican Communion to be held at Lambeth, if GOD permit, in the summer of next year.

"In accordance with the precedent of 1878, it has been arranged that the Conference shall assemble on Tuesday, July 3rd, 1888. After four days' session there will be an adjournment, in order that the various Committees appointed by the Conference may have opportunity of deliberation. The Conference will re-assemble on Monday, July 23rd, or Tuesday, July 24th, and will conclude its session on Friday, July 27th.

"Information as to the Services to be held in connection with the Conference, and other particulars, will be made public as the time draws near.

"I have received valuable suggestions from my Episcopal brethren in all parts of the world as to the subjects upon which it is thought desirable that we should deliberate.

"These suggestions have been carefully weighed by myself and by the Bishops who have been good enough to co-operate with me in making the preliminary arrangements, and the following are the subjects definitely selected for discussion:—

I.—The Church's practical work in relation to (*a*) Intemperance, (*b*) Purity, (*c*) Care of Emigrants, (*d*) Socialism.

II.—Definite Teaching of the Faith to various classes, and the means thereto.

III.—The Anglican Communion in relation to the Eastern Churches, to the Scandinavian and other Reformed Churches, to the Old Catholics, and others.

IV.—Polygamy of heathen converts. Divorce.

V.—Authoritative standards of Doctrine and Worship.

VI.—Mutual relations of Dioceses and Branches of the Anglican Communion.

"May I venture again to invite your earnest prayer that the Divine Head of the Church may be pleased to prosper with His blessing this our endeavour to promote His glory, and the advancement of His Kingdom upon earth.

"I remain,

"Your faithful Brother and Servant in Christ,

"EDW: CANTUAR:"

No less than 147 Bishops signified their intention of being present at the Conference. One of these died after accepting the invitation.[1] Three others were at the last moment prevented from leaving their Dioceses. On the other hand, two Bishops were consecrated[2] during the actual month of Conference, and the total number who took part in its deliberations was thus 145. This was proportionally a much larger attendance than at either of the previous Conferences. In 1867, 144 Bishops were invited, and 76 attended. In 1878, 173 were invited, and 100 attended. In 1888, 211 were invited, and 145 attended.

The official proceedings began, as in 1878, with a service held at Canterbury, on Saturday, June 30th. After hospitable entertainment in St. Augustine's Missionary College, the Bishops assembled and robed in the Chapter-House, and walked in procession through the cloisters to the great west door of the Cathedral, where they were received by the Archbishop and by the Cathedral Clergy. The Archbishop was attended by his Chaplains, but the arrangements as to space in the choir of the Cathedral did not admit of such attendance in the case of the other Bishops. As the long procession, including, besides the

[1] The Bishop of Fond du Lac, U.S.A.
[2] The Bishops of Bedford and Leicester.

Bishops, the members of the Cathedral body, the City Clergy, and the Mayor and Corporation of Canterbury, moved up the nave and choir, Psalm lxviii. was chanted, and the hymn "Onward, Christian Soldiers," sung. The Bishops, about 100 in number, were ranged on either side upon the altar-steps, and the Archbishop took his place in St. Augustine's Chair, which had once again been placed for the purpose in the centre of the altar-steps. The *Te Deum* having been chanted, the Archbishop, seated in his chair, delivered the following address:—

"Brethren most dear, and to me most reverend, few privileges of my office can surpass that which, though unworthy, I exercise to-day. It is to bid you welcome in the name of the Lord. Happy should my soul be if it were given me to take in all that such welcome means. Welcome from all continents, and seas, and shores, where the English tongue is spoken. Welcome, bearers of the great commission to be His witnesses unto the end of the earth. Welcome, disciples of the great determination to 'refuse fables' and seek the inspiration of the Church at the fountain-head of inspired reason. Welcome to the Chair, which, when filled least worthily, most takes up its own parable, and speaks of unbroken lines of government and law and faith, and forgets not the yet earlier Christianity of the land whose own lines soon flowed into and blended with the Roman and the Gallic and the Saxon strains. Round this Chair have clustered the glorious memorials you see through ages, none more dear than his who spoke from it last with a pathos and courage quite his own. His simple words to you, our brethren of the great Republic, 'the particular welcome from himself,' which his great sorrow and your love privileged him to give you, still shed a tender human light upon the solemn matters we are to treat of, and the heavenly enterprises to which we and our ancestors are pledged. We know how dear to you is this sanctuary of our fathers and yours—yes, of 'your Father and our Father.' And even because of the potency of its deep appeal to us to be

holy in worship, pure in doctrine, strong in life—even for this appeal's sake we bid you here remember the pregnant words of Gregory to Augustine himself, '*Non pro locis res, sed pro bonis rebus loca amanda sunt.*' (Love not the things for the sake of the genius of the place, love the place for the good things wrought there.) This he said in answer to Augustine's question: 'The faith being one, are there different customs in different Churches?' The answer was worthy of him who has been called the greatest of the Popes, and called the first of the Methodists. He says, you remember: 'What thou hast found in any Church more pleasing to the Almighty GOD, that do thou solicitously choose out, and in the English Church, young in the faith, pour in with excellent instruction what thou gatherest from many Churches.' For the moment, while his Church was young, Augustine stood in a strange, unique position, commissioned to represent in one person the very Church itself which sent him, and bound to represent the future Church for which he was responsible. Were not the words prophetic and characteristic? The task assigned him has surely fulfilled itself in the manifoldness of his Church, the embracingness, the comprehensiveness, and the integrity of her spirit—the versatility with which she enters into the life of new nations, the readiness with which she receives them to herself, the simplicity of the unvarying rule of her faith, yet the steadfastness of the claim she makes for other Churches, as well as for herself, that they may have liberty in things doubtful or indifferent. We honour her when we say she has all the right which the most venerable Churches have to order her service of GOD, as they did, 'according to the diversities of countries, times, and men's manners,' so that nothing be ordained against GOD'S word. We vindicate her dignity when we say the right is hers, not ours. It is for her to choose for us, and not we for ourselves; for her in her lasting power, not for us separately in our passing weakness. We honour her when we say that her right is the right of all Churches, and of no individuals. If this voice of Gregory to Augus-

tine be worked into the fabric of our Church, it may well be the 'sermon in stones' which we shall hear to-day as the last echoes of the service tremble along the arches, and seem to fancy's ear to quiver with anxiety to leave one true tone with us for comfort and for strength. It is this: liberty for all the holy Churches of GOD, loyal allegiance of Churchmen each to his own.

"Lastly, may He inspire and bless the work of all believers, be they Churchmen or no, who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and truth."

Evensong followed, the Anthem being Mendelssohn's "The Sorrows of Death," and the Hymn, "The Church's One Foundation." As the great procession moved onwards from the choir, the Archbishop pronounced the Benediction a second time over the multitude assembled in the nave.

A second great service was held in Westminster Abbey on Monday evening, July 2nd, when the sermon was preached by the Archbishop of Canterbury, who took for his text Ephesians iv. 16: "All the body, fitly framed and knit together, through that which every joint supplieth."[1]

Nearly all the Bishops who had accepted the invitation to the Conference were present at this service, each attended by his Chaplain. They were marshalled in long procession at the west end of the nave, and during the service were seated in the choir and under the lantern, the general congregation occupying the transepts. The Archbishops and Metropolitans, with their Chaplains, had places assigned to them in the sacrarium. The special Psalms and Lessons were: Psalms civ., cxlv; Isaiah xlix. 1–24; Acts ii. 1–22. Sterndale Bennett's Anthem, "GOD is a Spirit," and Bishop Cleveland Coxe's Hymn, "Saviour, Sprinkle Many Nations," had also been specially chosen for the occasion.

On the following morning, Tuesday, July 3rd, the Conference opened with a Celebration of the Holy Communion in Lambeth Palace Chapel, the introductory sermon or

[1] See "The Lambeth Conferences," p. 228.

address being delivered by Bishop Whipple, of Minnesota, who had been deputed to this office by the Presiding Bishop of America,[1] at the request of the Archbishop of Canterbury. The closing sentences of the sermon[2] were as follows:—

"To none is this Council so dear as to those whose lives are spent in the darkness of heathenism, or who have gone out to new lands to lay foundation for the work of the Church of God. In loneliness, with deferred hopes, neglected by brethren, your only refuge to cry as a child to God, it is a joy for you to feel the beating of a brother's heart, and hear the music of a brother's voice, and kneel with brothers at the dear old trysting-place, the Table of our Lord. Let us consecrate all we have and are to Him; let us remember loved ones far away; let us gather the work we have so long garnered in our hearts and lay it at His feet. We shall not have met in vain if out of the love learned of Him we give each to other and to all fellow-labourers for Him a brother's love, a brother's sympathy, and a brother's prayers. I do not know how to clothe in words the thronging memories which cluster round us in this holy place, what searchings of heart, what cries to God, what communions with Christ, what consolations of the Holy Spirit, have been witnessed in this sacred place. I cannot call over the long roll of saints, confessors, and martyrs, whose 'names are written in the Lamb's Book of Life.' Two names will be remembered to-day by us all. One, that gentle Archbishop Longley, who in the greatness of his love saw with a prophet's eye the mission of the Church, and planned these Conferences that our hearts might beat as one in the battle of the last time. The other, the wisest of counsellors, and the most loving of brethren, the great-hearted Archbishop Tait, whose dying legacy to his brethren was 'Love one another.' They have finished their course and entered into rest. A little more work, a few more trials, and we, too, shall finish our course. We are not two companies: the militant and the triumphant

[1] Right Rev. D. S. Tuttle, D.D.
[2] See "The Lambeth Conferences," p. 241.

are one. We are the advance and rear of one host, travelling to the Canaan of GOD'S rest. GOD grant that we, too, may so follow Christ that we may have an abundant entrance to His eternal kingdom."

The historic Chapel was filled to overflowing by the Bishops in their robes, no one else being present except the Chaplains of the Archbishop of Canterbury. He was himself the Celebrant, assisted by his Provincial Officers, the Bishops of London, Winchester, Rochester, Lincoln and Salisbury.

The order of procession adopted at all these services was the same, and was simpler than that of the former Conferences. Due precedence was given to Archbishops, to Metropolitans and Presiding Bishops, and to the Bishops of London, Durham, and Winchester; all other Bishops, without distinction, being arranged according to date of consecration.[1]

The great Library had been prepared, as in 1878, for the sessions of the Conference, a low platform having on this occasion been specially erected, with places for the three Archbishops and the seven Metropolitans, in a semi-circle on either side of the President's chair.

The secretarial work was, for the third time, undertaken by the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol,[2] who was assisted by the Dean of Windsor,[3] and the Archdeacon of Maidstone,[4] the last-named having been added as Assistant-Secretary a few weeks before the Conference owing to the unexpected pressure of correspondence.

A shorthand writer, as on the two previous occasions, made a verbatim report of all the discussions for preservation at Lambeth.

The proceedings during the first week of session followed exactly upon the lines laid down by Archbishop Tait in 1878. Certain speakers had been selected, specially qualified to open the several discussions, the motion being in

[1] See "The Lambeth Conferences," p. 256.
[2] The Right Rev. C. J. Ellicott, D.D.
[3] The Very Rev. Randall T. Davidson, M.A.
[4] The Ven. B. F. Smith, M.A.

each case for the appointment of a Committee to consider the particular subject, and to report to the Conference in its closing week of session. Twelve such Committees were appointed in all, some of the subjects being, by general consent, divided into two, or varied in form from the wording of the official agenda paper.[1]

A strong "Committee of Reference" was appointed in case any important questions, not covered by the programme, should be suggested, in the form of questions, for consideration and reply. But its work was light, and had reference mainly to the procedure of the Conference itself. In accordance with the unanimous recommendation of this Committee, it was decided that no attempt should be made to secure the "adoption" of the various Reports presented by the Committees, but that formal resolutions should in each case be moved by the several Chairmen.

The memorials and petitions which arrived each day were notified to the Conference by the President's direction, but it was made clear, as on former occasions, that no answer could in any case be returned.

The Committees met frequently during the fortnight which intervened between the two weeks of full session. Some of them were accommodated in the newly opened "Church House," in Dean's Yard, which was thus put in its first days to one of the most important of the uses that its promoters had in view. Other Committees met at Lambeth, at Farnham, at Ely, and at London House. When the Conference re-assembled on Monday, July 23rd, the Reports were all in print, and were circulated in time for the respective discussions.

The substitution of carefully worded resolutions in place of motions for the actual "adoption" of the several Reports worked very successfully. It was agreed that when any of the minority desired it, the numbers voting for and against the adoption of any of the resolutions ultimately carried should be made public. But in the case of three only out of the 32 resolutions of the Conference,[2]

[1] See p. 125

[2] See p. 119.

was such a request made. Resolutions or amendments lost on a division were not made public in any form. It was also decided that the Reports of the Committees, though not formally adopted, should, unless otherwise decided by vote of Conference, be printed and circulated with the official resolutions. The names of the members of Committee were to be printed on the Reports, which were all, however, to be prefaced by a note, for the protection of minorities, pointing out that the Reports had not in all cases been unanimously adopted by the Committees responsible for them.

The Archbishop of Canterbury was requested to draft, with such assistance as he might invite, an Encyclical Letter, embodying the results of the deliberations of the Conference in a form suited for general circulation. This was done, and on the last day of session, Friday, July 27th, the draft Encyclical Letter was considered, paragraph by paragraph, and, after certain alterations had been made, the Archbishop was requested, without one dissentient voice, to sign it on behalf of the Conference.[1] An Address to the Queen,[2] which had lain in the gallery for signature during the sessions of the Conference, was formally read by the Archbishop, and the Conference closed with the Doxology and Benediction.

A solemn valedictory and thanksgiving service was held next day in St. Paul's Cathedral. It was attended not only by the Bishops,[3] and their Chaplains, but by the Lower Houses of Convocation both of Canterbury and York, by the House of Laymen of the Province of Canterbury, and by the legal and other officers of the Primate. All these walked in procession from the west door of the Cathedral to the choir. The service consisted of Holy Communion and Sermon, followed by a grand *Te Deum*.[4] The Celebrant was the Archbishop of Canterbury. The Bishop of Minnesota read the Epistle; the Bishop of London the Gospel. The Sermon was preached by the Archbishop of

[1] See p. 106. [2] See "The Lambeth Conferences," p. 252.
[3] About 130 Bishops were present. [4] Gounod.

York, who took as his text Romans viii. 19, "The earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of GOD."[1]

An enormous congregation crowded the space under the dome, as well as the nave, transepts, and both aisles. The service lasted more than three hours. After the *Te Deum*, the long procession returned to the west door, and the third Lambeth Conference was at an end.

Of the 145 Bishops who took part in it, 46 belonged to England and Wales,[2] 11 to Ireland, 6 to Scotland, 29 to the United States of America, and 53 to Colonial and Missionary Dioceses throughout the world.

Warm thanks were tendered to all those on whom the business arrangements of the Conference had devolved; and, not least, to the Committee of laymen who had again, as in 1878, under Mr. Talbot's guidance, made themselves responsible for the organisation of the hospitality offered to American and Colonial Bishops. Mr. Tallents acted as Hon. Secretary of this important Committee.

The Encyclical Letter and Reports were immediately published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and obtained a wide and rapid circulation, more than 18,000 having been sold before the close of the year.

The Encyclical Letter and the Resolutions of the Conference were translated into Greek and Latin[3] by Bishop Wordsworth of Salisbury, who thus carried on the work undertaken on the two previous occasions by his father, the Bishop of Lincoln.

The foregoing narrative has dealt simply with the three Conferences in their bare official aspect. The indirect results which accrue from such gatherings are probably at least as great as those of an official kind. For an estimate of these indirect results, however, and for the impression made by the debates of the earlier Conferences upon those

[1] See "The Lambeth Conferences," p. 364.

[2] Viz., 32 Diocesan Bishops, 8 Bishops Suffragan, and 6 ex-Colonia Bishops holding commissions in England. (See p. 102.)

[3] See "The Lambeth Conferences," p. 376.

who attended them, the reader must turn to the accounts which have been published in ample number in the Biographies of Bishops on both sides of the Atlantic.[1]

The keen interest aroused on every side by the Conference of 1888 has given evidence enough, were such required, that those who planned in faith and courage the first of these decennial gatherings were right in believing that a solid gain must follow, not to the Anglican Communion only, but to the Church of Christ throughout the world.

[1] *E.g.*, Lives of Bishops Sumner, Gray, Hopkins, Ewing, Selwyn, Kerfoot, Wilberforce, Wordsworth, etc.

CHAPTER IV

THE FOURTH CONFERENCE, 1897

THE next Conference was held at Lambeth in July, 1897.

The formal letter of invitation was issued by Archbishop Benson in August, 1895. In this he reminded the Bishops that 1897 was the thirteenth centenary year since the landing of St. Augustine in England: he was summoning the Conference for that year to mark the occasion.

In October, 1896, Archbishop Benson was called to his rest, and the Conference, when it met in the summer of 1897, was presided over by his successor, Archbishop Temple.

The Episcopate had again largely increased in numbers, and 240 Bishops received invitations. Of these 194 were present at the Conference.

The proceedings opened with a Devotional Day at Lambeth on Wednesday, June 30th, when addresses were given by the Bishop of Lincoln (Dr. King). On July 1st the Bishops attended evensong in Westminster Abbey, when a sermon was preached by the Archbishop of York (Dr. Maclagan).

On the following day (Friday, July 2nd) a large number of Bishops visited Ebbs Fleet and Richborough Castle, where 1300 years before Augustine and his missionaries had landed and held their first interview with King Ethelbert of Kent.

From Richborough the Bishops went to Canterbury, where the next day (Saturday, July 3rd) a Service of Wel-

come was held, as on previous occasions, in the Cathedral, and an address was given by the Archbishop of Canterbury.

On this occasion there was also a special service in St. Martin's Church, "the oldest church in England," and the Bishops were subsequently received at a luncheon in St. Augustine's Missionary College.

On Monday, July 5th, the Conference commenced its sittings in the Guard-Room at Lambeth Palace, after a celebration of the Holy Communion in Westminster Abbey.

The sittings continued till July 10th, when twelve Committees were appointed to report upon the subjects upon which preliminary discussion had been held.

These subjects were:—

I.—The Organisation of the Anglican Communion.
II.—Religious Communities.
III.—The Critical Study of Holy Scripture.
IV.—Foreign Missions.
V.—Reformation Movements on the Continent of Europe and elsewhere.
VI.—Church Unity in its relation:
(*a*) To the Churches of the East.
(*b*) To the Latin Communion.
(*c*) To other Christian bodies.
VII.—International Arbitration.
VIII.—Industrial Problems.
IX.—The Book of Common Prayer.
(*a*) Additional Services.
(*b*) Local Adaptation.
X.—The Duties of the Church to the Colonies.
XI.—Degrees in Divinity.
XII.—To consider questions of difficulty which may be submitted to it by Bishops attending the Conference.

On Tuesday, July 13th, the Bishops, after attending service in St. George's Chapel, Windsor Castle, were received by H.M. Queen Victoria.

On Thursday, July 22nd, the Conference re-assembled to receive and consider the reports of the different Committees, and sat till Saturday, July 31st. Within a few days was published the Encyclical Letter,[1] together with the Reports and Resolutions of the Conference.[2]

On Sunday, August 1st, the Bishops attended a service in connection with the Boards of Missions of Canterbury and York in St. Paul's Cathedral, and the next day a solemn Service of Thanksgiving was held in the Cathedral, when the farewell sermon was preached by the Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Temple).

Before dispersing, the Bishops paid a visit, on Tuesday, August 3rd, to Glastonbury Abbey, where a solemn service, held on this traditional site of early British Christianity, brought the proceedings of the Conference to a striking close.

Of the 194 Bishops who took part in the 1897 Conference, 58 belonged to England and Wales,[3] 10 to Ireland, 7 to Scotland, 49 to the United States of America, and 70 to Colonial and Missionary Dioceses throughout the world.

[1] See p. 182.
[2] See pp. 212 and 199.
[3] Viz., 32 Diocesan Bishops, 19 Bishops Suffragan, and 7 ex-Colonial Bishops holding Commissions in England. (See p. 176.)

CHAPTER V

THE FIFTH CONFERENCE, 1908

THE fifth Conference was held at Lambeth Palace in July, 1908.

In July, 1907, Archbishop Davidson issued through the Metropolitans an invitation corresponding to those of previous years, addressed, that is, to Bishops holding Diocesan Sees or permanent commissions as Suffragans or Assistant Bishops. More than 250 Bishops accepted the invitation, and 242 of these were present at the Conference.

The formal proceedings began, as in former years, with a Service for the reception of all the Bishops in Canterbury Cathedral, at 3 p.m., on Saturday, July 4th, the address being given by the Archbishop from St. Augustine's Chair on the altar steps. The Archbishop made reference to the association of Canterbury Cathedral with various junctures in the story of English Church life—Magna Charta, the Becket Shrine, the Black Prince, the Elizabethan Festival, the later links with America and the American Church, and the stimulus thus given for the work of our own day.

A Celebration of the Holy Communion had taken place at 8 a.m., both in the Cathedral and in St. Martin's Church, and all the Bishops were invited to meet at St. Augustine's College, where a luncheon was given in the large Hall, previous to the Service of Reception in the Cathedral.

A garden-party was afterwards held at the Deanery, after which most of the Bishops returned to London for the Thanksgiving Service in Westminster Abbey, at 11 a.m. on Sunday, July 5th. The sermon at this service was

preached by Dr. Armitage Robinson, Dean of Westminster.

The Conference was opened at Lambeth Palace on Monday, July 6th, the sittings being held in the Library of the Palace, as they had been for the gatherings of 1878 and 1888. The Conference of 1867 and the Conference of 1897 had been held in the Guard-Room of the Palace. The Conference sat daily till Saturday, July 11th, and during the week 11 Committees were appointed to deal with the specified subjects which had been already named on the Agenda paper. The subjects were as follows:—

I.—The Faith and Modern Thought.
II.—Supply and Training of Clergy.
III.—Religious Education.
IV.—Foreign Missions.
V.—The Book of Common Prayer.
VI.—Administration of Holy Communion.
VII.—Ministries of Healing.
VIII.—Marriage Problems.
IX.—Moral Witness of the Church.
X.—Organisation in the Anglican Communion.
XI.—Reunion and Intercommunion.

On Monday, July 20th, His Majesty King Edward received the Bishops at Buckingham Palace, and after they had been severally presented, His Majesty received an Address signed by the Archbishop of Canterbury on behalf of the Conference.

On Thursday, July 23rd, there was a Devotional Day at Fulham Palace, the addresses being given in Fulham Parish Church by Dr. Copleston, Metropolitan of India.

During the fortnight of July 13th–25th, the Committees held their sessions, some at Lambeth, some in the Church House, Westminster, and others elsewhere. The Conference re-assembled on Monday, July 27th, and sat till Wednesday, August 5th. On the concluding days of the sessions, the Encyclical Letter [1] which had been drafted and

[1] See p. 294.

circulated beforehand was discussed and adopted, together with the Resolutions of the Conference, based upon the Reports of the different Committees.[1]

On Thursday, August 6th, the Conference was closed by a solemn Celebration of the Holy Communion in St. Paul's Cathedral, at 10 a.m., the sermon being preached by Dr. Tuttle, Presiding Bishop of the American Church.

Of the 242 Bishops present at the Conference of 1908, 79 belonged to England and Wales,[2] 12 to Ireland, 7 to Scotland, 55 to the United States of America, and 89 to Colonial and Missionary Dioceses throughout the world.

[1] See pp. 318 and 338.

[2] Viz., 37 Diocesan Bishops, 28 Bishops Suffragan, and 14 ex-Colonial Bishops holding Commissions in England. (See p. 287.)

CHAPTER VI

THE SIXTH CONFERENCE, 1920

THE sixth Lambeth Conference was held at Lambeth Palace in July, 1920.

This Conference was due to be held in 1918, and the preliminary notices had been sent out in August, 1915, but the continuance of the Great War rendered it impossible that it should take place in that year. After the Armistice in November, 1918, the Archbishop of Canterbury wrote to all the Metropolitans to ask whether they would prefer the date to be 1920 or 1921, and the result was almost unanimous in favour of 1920.

In February, 1919, Archbishop Davidson issued, through the Metropolitans, to Bishops holding Diocesan Sees or permanent commissions as Suffragan Bishops, a letter of invitation, giving dates and suggesting certain subjects, and asking each Bishop to mention any other subjects which he thought might appropriately be discussed by the Conference, and also to state on which Committees, if any, he would like to serve.

It is worthy of note that Bishop Tuttle, Bishop of Missouri, who, as Presiding Bishop of the American Episcopal Church, transmitted the invitations to all the American Bishops, was unique in having been entitled to an invitation to all six Lambeth Conferences. Unfortunately the condition of his health prevented his attendance at this Conference, and his place as Presiding Bishop was taken by the Bishop of Tennessee.[1]

[1] Right Rev. T. F. Gailor, D.D.

The definite invitations to the Conference were issued in July, 1919, together with the eight subjects which were to form the agenda. These had been settled at a series of more or less informal meetings of the Bishops from overseas who could be got together, including all available members of the Consultative Body. Invitations were not sent out to Assistant Bishops till early in the year 1920, their position being an uncertain one. At the opening session on July 5th a special resolution was passed inviting the presence of six Bishops who had retired (and who were therefore not entitled to an invitation), whose attendance was thought to be of value to the Conference, but of these only three accepted. Altogether some 368 Bishops were invited to attend, of whom 280 to 290 accepted, but, many being prevented at the last moment by transport and other difficulties from coming, the actual number present was 252.

The Episcopal Secretaries of the Conference were the Bishop of Peterborough [1] and Bishop H. H. Montgomery,[2] while the Rev. G. K. A. Bell [3] (resident Chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury) acted as Assistant Secretary.

A Committee of ladies was appointed by the Archbishop to deal with the arrangements for hospitality for Bishops from overseas. By this means, every Bishop who so desired had hospitality provided for himself and his family for part or the whole of the Conference, while others who wished to be more independent were accommodated at a small charge in King's College Hostel in Vincent Square. Every Bishop from overseas was invited to stay at Lambeth Palace, in most cases with his wife or some other relation, for at least two nights. The Hospitality Committee also made excellent arrangements whereby relatives of the Bishops were shown the "sights" of London, and were taken on excursions into the country.

The first function definitely connected with the Lambeth Conference was the Devotional Day for the Bishops, held at

[1] Right Rev. F. T. Woods, D.D.
[2] Formerly Bishop of Tasmania.
[3] Bishop of Chichester, 1929.

Fulham Palace on Friday, July 2nd, the Addresses being given in Fulham Parish Church by the Right Rev. Bishop Gore, D.D.[1]

The formal proceedings began on Saturday, July 3rd, at Canterbury, where the Service of Welcome was held in the Cathedral at 3 p.m. A very large general congregation was present, the Cathedral being filled in every part. No one present could forget the almost startling beauty of the Cathedral when the long procession of Bishops moved slowly from the west door to the choir, the black or scarlet of their robes contrasting vividly with the white rochets, the varied-coloured hoods of some of the American Bishops striking an unaccustomed note. The lesson, taken from Ephesians iv, included the sixteenth verse, which may have reminded some present that Archbishop Benson had preached from that text at the great service in Westminster Abbey on July 2nd, 1888, during the third Lambeth Conference. Archbishop Davidson from St. Augustine's Chair, which was placed for the occasion before the high altar, addressed the assembled Bishops. In the course of his address he said :—

" Brothers—Once again, in the Name which is above every name, I greet you here.

" We are gathered from the whole round world, at an hour which must for ever stand by itself in human history : an hour of strain and unrest, an hour of proud bereavement and of deliberate hope. We are gathered upon holy ground, wherein each one of you has his rightful heritage; gathered for thanksgiving, for intercession, for dedication, for resolve; gathered in full assurance of Faith.

" What does this gathering of Bishops, larger than any that ever met on English soil, what does it truly mean? . . . There are voices which tell us in courteous, not scornful, challenge that it is all an anachronism. ' Your credal phrases, your holy rites,' they urge, ' are out of date. They have had their day. They have their picturesque beauty still. But they are outworn. The forcefulness they bore for men

[1] Formerly Bishop of Oxford.

of old—say, when these arches first rose white among the Kentish woods, or in the receptive Reformation days—is theirs no longer. Knowledge waxes. The old Faith wanes. Its coast-line crumbles and is eroded by every incoming wave of scientific discovery and conquest. If your Creed is to survive at all it must be recast with no timorous or cautious hand, but to its very foundations.'

"Now we do not ignore or brush contemptuously aside that phase of contemporary thought and criticism. It is here, and we must recognise it. It cuts deep. Sometimes it swings far. But the contention, at least when thus bluntly stated, is, we steadfastly believe, not true. No. 'Bonum est nos hic esse.' We do well to be here, in Canterbury Cathedral. We do well to say the old Creed, to uplift the familiar, the well-proven prayers. The phrases, though cast in other days, other surroundings than ours, and retaining their birth-marks, are no empty survival of effete or dying things. They live. They have hands and feet. Of course it is true that in this Cathedral Choir, if anywhere on earth, we are in touch with sacred things of old. Yes, but not only with things of old. We are in touch with Him Who liveth and was dead, with Him Who is Omega as well as Alpha, with Him Who hath, not had, the Keys. Speaking from this spot a generation ago, Archbishop Benson reminded us that 'Our century and decade are the times of Christ. The present day is one of His days, and we are His contemporaries.'

"'I am with you,' Jesus Christ said, 'I am with you all the days, even to the end of the age.'

"Therefore, brothers, just because we believe that this is so, we are *here* to-day—here in the right place, among the monuments of Christian thinkers and teachers and doers of long ago, fallible, erring, earnest men, who in Christ's Name said and wrought their best, as we—with no human guarantee against error, but with humble confidence and hope—mean to do our best in that same strength to-day.

"It may perhaps be true that in no two centuries of the Church's life, for no two leaders in widely sundered days, can inherited words ever carry precisely the same import and

proportion and balance, or give identically the same stimulus, or the same light. To this chair cling varied memories. An Anselm, a Langton, a Cranmer, a Secker, a Benson, had each of them a revelation to understand and to assimilate, a message to carry to his contemporaries, an interpretation to offer. So have we. But for us, as for them, it is the old Creed which stands. Round it, and with its use, the Christian Society has found ever new meaning and new strength in discipleship, brotherhood, ministry, sacraments: all of them for the good of men.

"Our Conference this month ranges outside any mere ecclesiastical grooves. It touches human needs on every side: International and inter-racial relations in East and West; industrial perplexities; psychical experiences and developments; marital and moral problems, domestic and civic; woman's place in council and in work. How best, we ask, can our Christian Faith illumine fields like these?

"We have learned to see, better perhaps than those who went before us, how little, after all, we know. 'We are living,' as a great leader, both scientist and Christian, has reminded us, 'we are living in a small oasis of knowledge surrounded by a vast unexplored region of impenetrable mystery.' Realise that adequately, and the dogmatism of those who denounce our Creed or our gathering here to-day as an irrational anachronism loses its force. The charge recoils on the accuser. Rather are men learning to look with fresh reverence upon every beam of light, be it old or new, which has irradiated, even dimly, the mysteries whereof thoughtful folk are becoming daily more aware. Half to their surprise, the philosopher and the reformer are, beyond doubt, awaking or reverting to the discovery that the old Christian Faith gives the clue to life's deepest mysteries, that the old-world Christian basis gives the soundest and most rational stand for ethical or social betterment. And so, if any ask what we Bishops are met for, after so much travel and with so much circumstance, to-day, we assert our firm belief that the message God has entrusted to us is needed more perhaps than ever before, in a world which is waiting half

consciously for its fuller and more thoughtful utterance. In that assurance we have come together to consider how best to tell out that message freshly among men.

"We desire to receive anew, if it may be, the Spirit of wisdom and understanding, of counsel and strength, that the everlasting Gospel of the Father's love revealed in Jesus Christ may at our hands take such shape, be so fashioned and so given to men as to meet not simply what was wanted long ago, but what is wanted now.

"Set at this unparalleled time in a bewildered world to do our part in repairing the vastest cataclysm which the human race has known, not one of us supposes that, as the peoples of Christendom stagger back into an uncertain equilibrium, we can just resume with simplicity and quietness and hope our former words and ways. Not so. Out of four years which have no precedent or parallel, new thoughts, new lessons, new warnings have been born, and a new setting of our Holy Faith. It would be folly indeed did we not, at such a time, for such a task as ours, have open eyes and ears for fresh plans and possibilities and adventures of our Faith. We pledge ourselves thereto in our Cathedral Church to-day. We believe, with an intensity beyond words, that it is just in proportion to our alertness to the whisper of any new voice from God in the world of nature, or of human impulse and endeavour and corporate life, just in proportion to our range of vision and of aspiration, that we shall find power from on high to make the message of Jesus Christ our Lord ring out and tell among the sons and daughters of men. . . .

"Turn where we will, the problems confronting us are new as well as old, and you and I, in the office entrusted to us, must needs be handling them every day. Therefore with keen eye and open mind, we ask Him to vouchsafe to us and to nourish in us during the coming weeks the Divine Spirit of counsel.

"Once more, I thank God that I am allowed to greet you here—that from this holy place, impregnate with ennobling memories, suggestive warnings, and mingled associations of a hundred sorts, we may carry reverently, resourcefully, and

hopefully into the perplexities of a sorely rent and distracted world a buoyant, an arresting, an invigorating message of strength and guidance from our living Lord, the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever.

" Join then with me to recite, in thankfulness and hope, the historic Creed of Christendom."

Most of the Bishops had travelled down to Canterbury by the special train in the morning, and, on arrival at the Cathedral, those who so desired listened to a short lecture from Canon Mason on the Shrine of St. Thomas Becket at the site in the Trinity Chapel (July 7th being the 700th Anniversary of the " translation " of his body to the Shrine), and were afterwards conducted to other parts of the Cathedral. Arrangements were also provided after the lecture for those who preferred to visit the excavations at St. Augustine's College or to see St. Martin's Church instead of going round the Cathedral. All the Bishops were entertained at luncheon in the Library of St. Augustine's College. The Cathedral Service was followed by a Garden Party given in the Green Court by the kind invitation of the Dean and Chapter, after which the majority of the Bishops returned to London by the special train soon after six o'clock.

On the following day the Opening Service took place in Westminster Abbey at 11 a.m., being a Celebration of Holy Communion preceded by the Litany sung in procession through the Cloisters, to the music of Thomas Tallis (1520–1585). The sermon was preached by the Right Rev. Bishop Ryle, Dean of Westminster, and formerly Bishop of Winchester. The offertory was given to the Fund for aiding Candidates for Holy Orders who had served in the Navy or Army. Taking as his text Ephesians iv. 3, " Endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace," the Bishop, after welcoming the assembled Bishops, and especially those from America, said : " No cloud shall hide from us the fair vision of the sacred bond of peace. We realise in this spot the joint heritage of our kinship. This is the cradle alike of British and American greatness. Here are the beginnings of our history. This Abbey stands for Christ at

the heart of the English-speaking world. God grant that our two peoples may never fail here to find the most indissoluble bond of peace in the unity of the Spirit of worship and thanksgiving." He went on to speak of some of the problems before the Conference, especially that of the position of women in the Church, pointing out that since the Conference of 1908 women had been raised to a level of more serious responsibility and were called to the discharge of graver duties. "Is the Church," he asked, "unable to find scope in its order and discipline to meet the offer of this wealth of spiritual energy?" He then dwelt on the question of Reunion, saying that "from whatever side the prospects of Reunion may be considered, let us persevere in prayer, and never acquiesce in disunion, and strive for these three things first of all: that the common belief in the Divinity of our Saviour Jesus Christ and in the doctrine of the Holy Trinity may ever rank as the essential bond of Christian peace by the side of which all differences of practice or order are to be regarded by comparison as secondary; that no test of Catholicity may be exacted, no theory of the undefinable be imposed which is posterior or subordinate to the great historic Eucharistic Creed of the Catholic Church; that the basis of all proposals for Reunion be wholly spiritual, and be kept free from all political considerations whatsoever." He made one practical appeal, strongly emphasising the desirability of adding to the phrase in the Nicene Creed—"I believe in one Catholic and Apostolic Church"—the "essential epithet Holy," which had been omitted "through a blunder of ignorance or inadvertence" by the Reformers of the sixteenth century. "So," he said, "justice is done. So courageous confession of error is made. So the law of progress is affirmed. So the higher law of love is not only sincerely proclaimed, but, without a shadow of misgiving, honourably fulfilled. May the Lambeth Conference of 1920, by one act of technical audacity, long be remembered in history as giving diligence to keep the Unity of the Spirit and as making one step forward in the promotion of the bond of peace."

Special tickets had been issued for friends and relatives of the Bishops, but most of the Nave and North Transept was open to the public, who filled every possible niche, as was the case with the other great services at Canterbury and in St. Paul's Cathedral.

The Conference itself began at Lambeth Palace at 11 a.m. on Monday, July 5th, the sessions being held in the Library of the Palace, as they had been for the gatherings of 1878, 1888, and 1908. The Conferences of 1867 and 1897 had been held in the Guard-Room. The Library was arranged more or less as it had been for the Conference of 1908, some of the bookcases being removed to accommodate the chairs, but an extra door was opened into the Library from the house, and an additional room added, in which a bookstall was arranged during the five weeks of the meetings. Here could be bought the books recommended for the different subjects on the agenda paper, as well as note-books and other stationery, while facilities were given for postage and telegraphy. A special telephone was installed for the use of the Bishops, and sets of large pigeon-holes, one for each Bishop, labelled with his individual number, were put up near the Library. Into these were sorted each day the vast amount of correspondence received by every member of the Conference, this being no light task, as the number of Societies and individuals who circularised every Bishop was immense. A reading-room was arranged in Morton's Tower, and the crypt under the Chapel was laid out as a writing-room.

Each morning there was a Celebration in Lambeth Palace Chapel at 8 a.m., and at 10.30 a short service was held for which a special form had been drawn up, and at which also various Litanies were used. The Intercession Paper for use before the Conference and during its meetings was compiled by the Bishop of Peterborough. These services were under the direction of the Bishop of Dover.[1] The Archbishop of Canterbury had, two months before, sent a letter to all the Home Diocesan Bishops, suggesting

[1] The Right Rev. H. E. Bilbrough, D.D.

that prayers for the Conference should be offered in all the Churches, and also a request for prayer had been sent to Free Church Ministers and the Moderators of the Scottish Churches.

The Conference sat daily from 11 a.m. to 5 p.m. until Saturday, July 10th, and during the week eight Committees were appointed to deal with the following subjects :—

(A) Relation to and Reunion with Other Churches.
  (1) Episcopal Churches.
  (2) Non-Episcopal Churches, with questions as to—
    (*a*) Recognition of Ministers;
    (*b*) " Validity " of Sacraments;
    (*c*) Suggested transitional steps.

(B) Missionary Problems.
  (1) Missions and Governments.
  (2) Missions and Growing Churches.
  (3) Liturgical Variations permissible to a Province or Diocese.
  (4) Marriage Questions and other practical problems.

(C) The Christian Faith in relation to—
  (1) Spiritualism.
  (2) Christian Science.
  (3) Theosophy.

(D) Problems of Marriage and Sexual Morality.

(E) Position of Women in the Councils and Ministrations of the Church.

(F) Christianity and International Relations, especially the League of Nations.

(G) The Opportunity and Duty of the Church in regard to Industrial and Social Problems.

(H) Development of Provinces in the Anglican Communion.

These were introduced by formal speeches from forty-seven Bishops. In the previous month the majority of the Bishops had been notified of the Committee or Committees on which they might be asked to serve, and a list of books had also been circulated, dealing with the subjects which

were to come before the Conference. To facilitate further the work of the Committees, care had been taken beforehand to obtain material from many quarters. For example questionnaires on the Church's "Relation to Non-Episcopal Churches" and "Marriage Questions" had been sent to representative Bishops, and summaries of their answers were laid before the Committees concerned. Moreover, at the Archbishop of Canterbury's request, a number of men and women, clerical and lay, had written papers on the subjects chosen for discussion, and fifty-five of these were placed before the various Committees. In many cases, the preliminary Secretary who had been appointed for each Committee found this expert knowledge most valuable to himself and his Committee in the work of preparation before the meetings took place. These were held from July 12th to 24th, the great Committee on Reunion sitting at Lambeth, and the remainder at Church House, with the exception of one for which a room was kindly lent by the S.P.G.

On Saturday, July 24th, His Majesty King George V. received the Bishops at Buckingham Palace, and, before they were severally presented, His Majesty accepted and replied to an Address signed by the Archbishop of Canterbury on behalf of the Conference. Two days before this the King and Queen had held a Garden Party to which the Bishops and their relatives were invited.

Receptions were also held by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, the Church Missionary Society, the Colonial and Continental Church Society, the British and Foreign Bible Society, the English-Speaking Union, and others, while the Mansion House Dinner and various Garden Parties were among the many forms of entertainment to which the members of the Conference and their friends were invited. Notable among these were the gatherings at Salisbury on June 24th, to commemorate the 700th Anniversary of the building of the Cathedral, and at Peterborough to commemorate the 800th Anniversary of that Cathedral, on June 29th. As well as these more

that prayers for the Conference should be offered in all the Churches, and also a request for prayer had been sent to Free Church Ministers and the Moderators of the Scottish Churches.

The Conference sat daily from 11 a.m. to 5 p.m. until Saturday, July 10th, and during the week eight Committees were appointed to deal with the following subjects :—

(A) Relation to and Reunion with Other Churches.
  (1) Episcopal Churches.
  (2) Non-Episcopal Churches, with questions as to—
    (*a*) Recognition of Ministers;
    (*b*) " Validity " of Sacraments;
    (*c*) Suggested transitional steps.
(B) Missionary Problems.
  (1) Missions and Governments.
  (2) Missions and Growing Churches.
  (3) Liturgical Variations permissible to a Province or Diocese.
  (4) Marriage Questions and other practical problems.
(C) The Christian Faith in relation to—
  (1) Spiritualism.
  (2) Christian Science.
  (3) Theosophy.
(D) Problems of Marriage and Sexual Morality.
(E) Position of Women in the Councils and Ministrations of the Church.
(F) Christianity and International Relations, especially the League of Nations.
(G) The Opportunity and Duty of the Church in regard to Industrial and Social Problems.
(H) Development of Provinces in the Anglican Communion.

These were introduced by formal speeches from forty-seven Bishops. In the previous month the majority of the Bishops had been notified of the Committee or Committees on which they might be asked to serve, and a list of books had also been circulated, dealing with the subjects which

were to come before the Conference. To facilitate further the work of the Committees, care had been taken beforehand to obtain material from many quarters. For example questionnaires on the Church's "Relation to Non-Episcopal Churches" and "Marriage Questions" had been sent to representative Bishops, and summaries of their answers were laid before the Committees concerned. Moreover, at the Archbishop of Canterbury's request, a number of men and women, clerical and lay, had written papers on the subjects chosen for discussion, and fifty-five of these were placed before the various Committees. In many cases, the preliminary Secretary who had been appointed for each Committee found this expert knowledge most valuable to himself and his Committee in the work of preparation before the meetings took place. These were held from July 12th to 24th, the great Committee on Reunion sitting at Lambeth, and the remainder at Church House, with the exception of one for which a room was kindly lent by the S.P.G.

On Saturday, July 24th, His Majesty King George V. received the Bishops at Buckingham Palace, and, before they were severally presented, His Majesty accepted and replied to an Address signed by the Archbishop of Canterbury on behalf of the Conference. Two days before this the King and Queen had held a Garden Party to which the Bishops and their relatives were invited.

Receptions were also held by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, the Church Missionary Society, the Colonial and Continental Church Society, the British and Foreign Bible Society, the English-Speaking Union, and others, while the Mansion House Dinner and various Garden Parties were among the many forms of entertainment to which the members of the Conference and their friends were invited. Notable among these were the gatherings at Salisbury on June 24th, to commemorate the 700th Anniversary of the building of the Cathedral, and at Peterborough to commemorate the 800th Anniversary of that Cathedral, on June 29th. As well as these more

formal receptions, large numbers of people, clerical and lay, were invited daily to Lambeth Palace during the full sessions of the Conference to meet the Bishops, and though very bad weather generally prevented the enjoyment of the garden on these occasions, much appreciation was felt at these opportunities of meeting the leaders of the Church from all over the world.

The Conference reassembled on Monday, July 26th, and sat till Saturday, August 7th, on many days beginning at 10.30 a.m. instead of 11.0, and holding an extra session between 5.0 and 7.15 p.m. During this fortnight, as during the first week, all the Bishops were entertained for luncheon and tea at the Palace. Very valuable secretarial aid was rendered by four or five Bishops who were constituted a Committee for the preparation of the Encyclical Letter and for drafting the Resolutions of the Conference which were based on the Reports of the different Committees. Drafts of the Encyclical Letter and Resolutions were circulated during the last week, and, after much weighty discussion, these utterances were finally adopted by the full Conference.

The firm of Messrs. W. B. Gurney & Sons acted, as for the last three Conferences, as the official shorthand writers to the Conference. Each day's proceedings were reported verbatim, the typescript of these shorthand notes being subsequently bound up and stored at Lambeth.

At the close of the sessions on the last morning, the Archbishop of York [1] put forward the following motion : " That the President do now leave the chair, and that Mrs. Davidson, suitably attended, be invited to attend the Conference and become a member of it for the time being." This having been carried with loud applause, Mrs. Davidson with some of the staff entered the Library, and the Archbishop of York then submitted to the Conference a motion of gratitude to Archbishop Davidson for his ability as a " Chairman of two hundred and fifty habitual Chairmen " and for his " unstinted hospitality and constant kindness,"

[1] The Most Rev. C. G. Lang, D.D.

after which, in the name of the members of the Conference, he presented him with a Primatial Cross in ebony and silver-gilt, at the same time asking Mrs. Davidson's acceptance of a cheque, begging her to purchase with it something that would be "an abiding and visible token of all that the Bishops here assembled think and feel about her." The Bishop of Tennessee [1] then made the presentation, speaking of the Archbishop's visit to the United States, the first visit to that country ever made by an Archbishop of Canterbury. The Archbishop of Armagh [2] and the Metropolitan of India [3] added their testimony, and the Archbishop and Mrs. Davidson then replied.

The Closing Service of the Conference took place in St. Paul's Cathedral on Sunday, August 8th, at 10.30 a.m., a very large congregation of the general public being present as well as those to whom special tickets had been issued. Bishop Gailor of Tennessee, acting Presiding-Bishop of the Episcopal Church in the United States of America, preached the sermon, in the course of which he said that in every plan or league for ensuring the permanent peace of the world the Church must stand firmly upon the principle that the nation was only a larger individual with responsibility of service to mankind, and that no nation in the lofty idealism of Jesus Christ could fulfil His law of righteousness by maintaining an attitude of selfish isolation and indifference in the Commonwealth of Nations. Referring to the discussions at the Conference, the Bishop said that they had prayed and studied and taken counsel in order to search out and forsake whatever might seem to stand in the way of the visible Reunion of the Universal Church. The wonderful unanimity with which they had reached an agreement upon the essential principles of Catholic Reunion must live in their memories as a blessed experience, and as they separated to return to their distant posts they would carry with them a clearer, a wider vision, and a

[1] The Right Rev. T. F. Gailor, D.D.
[2] The Most Rev. C. F. D'Arcy, D.D.
[3] The Most Rev. F. Westcott, D.D.

deeper and more confident assurance of the reality of their service.

Before pronouncing the Blessing, Archbishop Davidson said a few words of farewell to the assembled Bishops. The alms were given to the Cathedral Preservation Fund.

During the Conference of 1920, much more careful arrangements were made with regard to the Press than in the five previous Conferences. Each evening in the first week and last fortnight of full sessions a short statement was sent to the leading newspapers and Press Agencies, showing the progress (so far as it could be made public) of the proceedings. Finally the Archbishop of Canterbury held a meeting on August 11th to which about thirty representatives of the Press came. The Archbishop and the Bishop of Peterborough explained the idea and motives of the " Appeal to all Christian people " which had been drawn up by the Conference, and which was published on August 12th. Copies of this Appeal, with a brief explanation, were circulated at this meeting. Together with the Encyclical Letter, this Appeal was later translated into various languages, including Latin, Greek, French, German, Italian, Russian, Chinese and Esperanto.

A " Message to Men and Women of Goodwill " was sent out by the Archbishop of Canterbury in the name of the Conference on August 10th. This obtained a wide circulation, and helped very materially to pave the way for the above-mentioned " Appeal," and for the full Report which was published on Saturday, August 14th. A summary of the Report had also been prepared, consisting of about a thousand words. This was circulated by the Press Association all over the country, and was sent out with the review copies of the Report. The summary was very widely reproduced, either in whole or in part, and proved to be a most effective agent for the right understanding of the whole Report of the Lambeth Conference.

It can hardly be questioned that far greater enthusiasm was shown by the Press for the Conference of 1920 than for any of its predecessors. That this increased keenness was

shared by the general public was indicated not only by the very rapid sale of the Report, but also by the personal interest shown in the movements of the Bishops. The Hospitality Committee had no difficulty in getting offers to entertain the Overseas Bishops, and indeed some disappointment was caused by the fact that there were not enough Bishops to go round among the houses thrown open to them. Many leading Clubs offered honorary membership to the members of the Conference, proprietors of illustrated and other papers sent free copies of their periodicals for the Bishops' reading-room, while the demand by people all over England to buy the chairs used in the Library during the Conference was surprising. These chairs, each with its small leather case for papers hung on the back, had been specially made for the purpose, and each bore on it the name of the Bishop who used it. It would be invidious to mention whose chairs were most eagerly sought after, but those used by certain prelates could have been sold over and over again, and there were at least a hundred applicants who could not be supplied at all. As on previous occasions, many of the Bishops took their own chairs away with them, and the picture of a particular Archbishop who left Lambeth carrying two chairs, one under each arm, and refusing all offers of assistance, will not easily be forgotten by those who saw it.

Of the 252 Archbishops and Bishops present at the Conference of 1920, 74 belonged to England,[1] 6 to Wales, 10 to Ireland, 7 to Scotland, 52 to the United States of America, and 103 to Colonial and Missionary Dioceses throughout the world.

[1] *Viz.*: 35 Diocesan Bishops, 29 Bishops Suffragan, 6 ex-Colonial Bishops holding commissions in England, and 4 retired Bishops.

PART II

DOCUMENTS, REPORTS, AND RESOLUTIONS, ILLUSTRATING THE HISTORY OF THE CONFERENCES

I

1867.

Formal "Address to the Faithful" from the Bishops attending the Conference of 1867. (See page 11.)

To the Faithful in Christ Jesus, the Priests and Deacons, and the Lay Members of the Church of Christ in Communion with the Anglican Branch of the Church Catholic—

We, the undersigned Bishops, gathered under the good providence of GOD for prayer and conference at Lambeth, pray for you that ye may obtain grace, mercy and peace from GOD our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ our Saviour.

We give thanks to GOD, brethren beloved, for the faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love towards the saints, which hath abounded amongst you; and for the knowledge of Christ which through you hath been spread abroad amongst the most vigorous races of the earth; and with one mouth we make our supplications to GOD, even the Father, that by the power of the Holy Ghost He would strengthen us with His might, to amend amongst us the things which are amiss, to supply the things which are lacking, and to reach forth unto higher measures of love and zeal in worshipping Him, and in making known His name; and we pray that in His good time He would give back unto His whole Church the Blessed gift of Unity in Truth.

And now we exhort you in love that ye keep whole and undefiled the faith once delivered to the saints, as ye have

received it of the Lord Jesus. We entreat you to watch and pray, and to strive heartily with us against the frauds and subtleties wherewith the faith hath been aforetime and is now assailed.

We beseech you to hold fast, as the sure work of GOD, all the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament; and that by diligent study of these oracles of GOD, praying in the Holy Ghost, ye seek to know more of the Lord Jesus Christ our Saviour, very GOD and very Man, ever to be adored and worshipped, whom they reveal unto us, and of the will of GOD, which they declare.

Furthermore, we entreat you to guard yourselves and yours against the growing superstitions and additions with which in these latter days the truth of GOD hath been overlaid; as otherwise, so especially by the pretension to universal sovereignty over GOD'S heritage asserted for the See of Rome, and by the practical exaltation of the Blessed Virgin Mary as mediator in the place of her Divine Son, and by the addressing of prayers to her as intercessor between GOD and man. Of such beware, we beseech you, knowing that the jealous GOD giveth not His honour to another.

Build yourselves up, therefore, beloved, in your most holy faith; grow in grace and in the knowledge and love of Jesus Christ our Lord. Show forth before all men by your faith, self-denial, purity, and godly conversation, as well as by your labours for the people amongst whom GOD hath so widely spread you, and by the setting forth of His Gospel to the unbelievers and the heathen, that ye are indeed the servants of Him who died for us to reconcile His Father to us, and to be a sacrifice for the sins of the whole world.

Brethren beloved, with one voice we warn you: the time is short; the Lord cometh; watch and be sober. Abide steadfast in the Communion of Saints, wherein GOD hath granted you a place. Seek in faith for oneness with Christ in the blessed Sacrament of His body and blood. Hold fast the Creeds and the pure worship and order, which of

GOD'S grace ye have inherited from the Primitive Church. Beware of causing divisions contrary to the doctrine ye have received. Pray and seek for unity amongst yourselves, and amongst all the faithful in Christ Jesus; and the good Lord make you perfect, and keep your bodies, souls and spirits, until the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ.

(*Signed*)

C. T. Cantuar.
M. G. Armagh.
R. C. Dublin.
A. C. London.
C. R. Winton.
C. St. David's.
J. Lichfield.
S. Oxon.
Thomas Vowler St. Asaph.
A. Llandaff.
John Lincoln.
W. K. Sarum.
John T. Norwich.
J. C. Bangor.
H. Worcester.
Charles Wordsworth, D.C.L., Bishop of St. Andrew's, Dunkeld, and Dumblane.
Thos. G. Suther, Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney.
William S. Wilson, Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway.
Thomas B. Morrell, Coadjutor Bishop of Edinburgh.
F. Montreal, Metropolitan of Canada.
G. A. New Zealand, Metropolitan of New Zealand.
R. Capetown, Metropolitan of South Africa.
Aubrey G. Jamaica.
T. Barbados.
J. Bombay.
H. Nova Scotia.
F. T. Labuan.
H. Grahamstown.
H. J. C. Christchurch.
Mathew Perth.
Benj. Huron.
W. W. Antigua.
E. H. Sierra Leone.
T. N. Honolulu.
J. T. Ontario.
J. W. Quebec.
W. J. Gibraltar.
H. L. Dunedin.
Edward, Bishop Orange River Free State.
A. N. Niagara.
William George Tozer, Missionary Bishop.
James B. Kelly, Coadjutor of Newfoundland.
S. Angl. Hierosol.
John H. Hopkins, Presiding Bishop of Pr. Ep. Church, in the United States.
Chas. P. McIlvaine, Bishop of Ohio.
G. J. Gloucester and Bristol.
E. H. Ely.
William Chester.
T. L. Rochester.
Horace Sodor and Man.
Samuel Meath.
H. Kilmore.
Charles Limerick Ardfert and Aghadoe.
Robert Eden, D.D., Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness, Primus.
Alexander Ewing, Bishop of Argyll and the Isles.

Manton Eastburn, Bishop of Massachusetts.

J. Payne, Bishop of Cape Palmas and parts adjacent.

H. J. Whitehouse, Bishop of Illinois.

Thomas Atkinson, Bishop of North Carolina.

Henry W. Lee, Bishop of Iowa.

Horatio Potter, Bishop of New York.

Thomas M. Clark, Bishop of Rhode Island.

Alexander Gregg, Bishop of Texas.

W. H. Odenheimer, Bishop of New Jersey.

G. T. Bedell, Assistant Bishop of Ohio.

Henry C. Lay, Missionary Bishop of Arkansas and the Indian Territory.

Jos. C. Talbot, Assistant Bishop of Indiana.

Richard H. Wilmer, Bishop of Alabama.

Charles Todd Quintard, Bishop of Tennessee.

John B. Kerfoot, Bishop of Pittsburgh.

J. P. B. Wilmer, Bishop of Louisiana.

C. M. Williams, Missionary Bishop to China.

J. Chapman, Bishop.

George Smith, late Bishop of Victoria (China).

David Anderson, late Bishop of Rupert's Land.

Edmund Hobhouse, Bishop of New Zealand.

II

1867.

The Formal Resolutions of the Conference of September 24th–27th, 1867. (See page 11.)

Introduction.

"We, Bishops of Christ's Holy Catholic Church in visible Communion with the United Church of England and Ireland, professing the Faith delivered to us in Holy Scripture, maintained by the Primitive Church and by the Fathers of the English Reformation, now assembled, by the good providence of God, at the Archiepiscopal Palace of Lambeth, under the presidency of the Primate of all England, desire:—*First*, to give hearty thanks to Almighty God for having thus brought us together for common counsels and united worship; *Secondly*, we desire to express the deep sorrow with which we view the divided condition of the flock of Christ throughout the world, ardently longing for the fulfilment of the prayer of our Lord, 'That all may be one, as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me'; and, *Lastly*, we do here solemnly record our conviction that unity will be most effectually promoted by maintaining the Faith in its purity and integrity, as taught in the Holy Scriptures, held by the Primitive Church, summed up in the Creeds, and affirmed by the undisputed General Councils, and by drawing each of us closer to our common Lord, by giving ourselves to much prayer and intercession, by the

cultivation of a spirit of charity, and a love of the Lord's appearing."

Resolution I.—"That it appears to us expedient, for the purpose of maintaining brotherly intercommunion, that all cases of establishment of new Sees, and appointment of new Bishops, be notified to all Archbishops and Metropolitans, and all Presiding Bishops of the Anglican Communion."

Resolution II.—"That, having regard to the conditions under which intercommunion between members of the Church passing from one distant Diocese to another may be duly maintained, we hereby declare it desirable:—

> "(1) That forms of Letters Commendatory on behalf of Clergymen visiting other Dioceses be drawn up and agreed upon.
>
> "(2) That a form of Letters Commendatory for lay members of the Church be in like manner prepared.
>
> "(3) That his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury be pleased to undertake the preparation of such forms."[1]

Resolution III.—"That a Committee be appointed to draw up a Pastoral Address to all members of the Church of Christ in communion with the Anglican Branch of the Church Catholic, to be agreed upon by the assembled Bishops, and to be published as soon as possible after the last sitting of the Conference."[2]

Resolution IV.—"That, in the opinion of this Conference, Unity in Faith and Discipline will be best maintained among the several branches of the Anglican Communion by due and canonical subordination of the Synods of the several branches to the higher authority of a Synod or Synods above them."

Resolution V.—"That a Committee of seven members (with power to add to their number, and to obtain the assistance of men learned in Ecclesiastical and Canon Law) be appointed to inquire into and report upon the

[1] See p. 75. [2] See p. 49.

subject of the relations and functions of such Synods, and that such Report be forwarded to his Grace, the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, with a request that, if possible, it may be communicated to any adjourned meeting of this Conference." [1]

Resolution VI.—"That, in the judgment of the Bishops now assembled, the whole Anglican Communion is deeply injured by the present condition of the Church in Natal; and that a Committee be now appointed at this General Meeting to report on the best mode by which the Church may be delivered from the continuance of this scandal, and the true faith maintained. That such Report be forwarded to his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, with the request that he will be pleased to transmit the same to all the Bishops of the Anglican Communion, and to ask for their judgment thereupon." [2]

Resolution VII.—"That we who are here present do acquiesce in the Resolution of the Convocation of Canterbury, passed on June 29th, 1866, relating to the Diocese of Natal, to wit:—

"'If it be decided that a new Bishop should be consecrated: As to the proper steps to be taken by the members of the Church in the province of Natal for obtaining a new Bishop, it is the opinion of this House—*first*, that a formal instrument, declaratory of the doctrine and discipline of the Church of South Africa should be prepared, which every Bishop, Priest and Deacon to be appointed to office should be required to subscribe; *secondly*, that a godly and well-learned man should be chosen by the clergy, with the assent of the lay-communicants of the Church, and *thirdly*, that he should be presented for consecration, either to the Archbishop of Canterbury—if the aforesaid instrument should declare the doctrine and discipline of Christ as received by the United Church of England and Ireland—or to the Bishops of the Church of South Africa, according as hereafter may be judged to be most advisable and convenient.'" [3]

[1] See p. 58. [2] See p. 73. [3] See p. 11.

Resolution VIII.—"That, in order to the binding of the Churches of our Colonial Empire and the Missionary Churches beyond them in the closest union with the Mother-Church, it is necessary that they receive and maintain without alteration the standards of Faith and Doctrine as now in use in that Church. That, nevertheless, each Province should have the right to make such adaptations and additions to the services of the Church as its peculiar circumstances may require. *Provided*, that no change or addition be made inconsistent with the spirit and principles of the Book of Common Prayer, and that all such changes be liable to revision by any Synod of the Anglican Communion in which the said Province shall be represented."

Resolution IX.—"That the Committee appointed by Resolution V., with the addition of the names of the Bishops of London, St. David's, and Oxford, and all the Colonial Bishops, be instructed to consider the constitution of a voluntary spiritual tribunal, to which questions of doctrine may be carried by appeal from the tribunals for the exercise of discipline in each Province of the Colonial Church, and that their report be forwarded to his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, who is requested to communicate it to an adjourned meeting of this Conference." [1]

Resolution X.—"That the resolutions submitted to this Conference relative to the discipline to be exercised by Metropolitans, the Court of Metropolitans, the scheme for conducting the Election of Bishops, when not otherwise provided for, the declaration of submission to the Regulation of Synods, and the question of what Legislation should be proposed for the Colonial Churches, be referred to the Committee specified in the preceding Resolution." [2]

Resolution XI.—"That a special Committee be appointed to consider the Resolutions relative to the notification of proposed Missionary Bishoprics, and the Subordination of Missionaries." [3]

[1] See p. 62. [2] See p. 66. [3] See p. 71.

Resolution XII.—"That the question of the bounds of the jurisdiction of different Bishops, when any question may have arisen in regard to them, the question as to the obedience of Chaplains of the United Church of England and Ireland on the Continent, and the Resolution submitted to the Conference relative to their return and admission into Home Dioceses, be referred to the Committee specified in the preceding Resolution."

Resolution XIII.—"That we desire to render our hearty thanks to Almighty God for the blessings vouchsafed to us in and by this Conference; and we desire to express our hope that this our meeting may hereafter be followed by other meetings to be conducted in the same spirit of brotherly love."

III

Reports of Committees Appointed by the Conference of 1867. (See page 12.)

A.—*Report of the Committee appointed under Resolution V., by the Conference of Bishops of the Anglican Communion, held at Lambeth Palace, September 24th–27th, 1867.*[1]

The subject of the functions and relations of the several Synods, on which the Committee is appointed to report, appears to them to be necessarily connected with questions as to the constitution of these bodies. The following Report, therefore, embraces the whole subject of Synods. In discussing it, your Committee deems it necessary to deal with the question in the abstract, without reference to existing laws and usages in the several branches of the Anglican Communion, and to lay down general principles, the adoption or application of which must depend on circumstances, such, for example, as the laws which any Church may have inherited or already established.

I. In the organisation of Synodal order for the government of the Church, the Diocesan Synod appears to be the primary and simplest form of such organisation.

By the Diocesan Synod the co-operation of all members of the body is obtained in Church action; and that acceptance of Church

[1] Resolution IV.—"That, in the opinion of this Conference, Unity in Faith and Discipline will be best maintained among the several branches of the Anglican Communion by due and canonical subordination of the Synods of the several branches to the higher authority of a Synod or Synods above them." (See p. 10.)

Resolution V.—"That a Committee of seven members (with power to add to their number, and to obtain the assistance of men learned in Ecclesiastical and Canon Law) be appointed to inquire into and report upon the subject of the relations and functions of such Synods, and that such Report be forwarded to his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, with a request that, if possible, it may be communicated to any adjourned meeting of this Conference."

rules is secured, which, in the absence of other law, usage, or enactment, gives to these rules the force of laws "binding on those who, expressly or by implication, have consented to them." [1]

For this reason, wherever the Church is not established by law, it is, in the judgment of your Committee, essential to order and good government that the Diocese should be organised by a Synod.

Your Committee consider that it is not at variance with the ancient principles of the Church, that both Clergy and Laity should attend the Diocesan Synod, and that it is expedient that the Synod should consist of the Bishop and Clergy of the Diocese, with Representatives of the Laity.

The Constitution of the Diocesan Synod may be determined either by rules for that branch of the Church established by the Synod of the Province, or by general consent in the Diocese itself, its rules being sanctioned afterwards by the Provincial Synod.

Your Committee, however, recommend that the following general rules should be adopted; viz., that the Bishop, Clergy, and Laity should sit together, the Bishop presiding; that votes should be taken by orders, whenever demanded; and that the concurrent assent of Bishop, Clergy, and Laity should be necessary to the validity of all acts of the Synod.

They consider that the Clerical members of the Synod should be those Clergy who are recognised by the Bishop, according to the rules of the Church in that Diocese, as being under his jurisdiction. Whether in large Dioceses, when the Clergy are very numerous, they might appear by representation, is a difficult question, and one on which your Committee are not prepared to express an opinion.

The Lay Representatives in the Synod ought, in the judgment of your Committee, to be Male Communicants of at least one year's standing in the Diocese, and of the full age of twenty-one. It should be required that the electors should be Members of the Church in that Diocese, and belong to the parish in which they claim to vote. It appears desirable that the regular meetings of the Synod should be fixed and periodical; but that the right of convening special meetings whenever they may be required should be reserved to the Bishop.

The office of the Diocesan Synod is, generally, to make regulations, not repugnant to those of higher Synods, for the order and good government of the Church within the Diocese, and to promulgate the decisions of the Provincial Synod.

II. The Provincial Synod—or, as it is called in New Zealand, the General Synod, and in the United States the General Con-

[1] Judgment of Judicial Committee of Privy Council in case of Long *v.* Bishop of Capetown. 1 Moore, P.C.C., N.S., 461.

vention—is formed, whenever it does not exist already by law and usage, through the voluntary association of Dioceses for united legislation and common action. The Provincial Synod not only provides a method for securing unity amongst the Dioceses which are thus associated, but also forms the link between these Dioceses and other Churches of the Anglican Communion.

Without questioning the right of the Bishops of any Province to meet in Synod by themselves, and without affirming that the presence of others is essential to a Provincial Synod, your Committee recommend that, whenever no law or usage to the contrary already exists, it should consist of the Bishops of the Province, and of Representatives both of the Clergy and of the Laity in each Diocese.

Your Committee need not define the method in which a Provincial Synod may be first constituted, but they assume that its constitution and rules will be determined by the concurrence of the several Dioceses duly represented.

Your Committee consider that it must be left to each Province to decide whether, and under what circumstances, the Bishops, Clergy, and Laity in a Provincial Synod should sit and discuss questions in the same chamber or separately; but, in the judgment of the Committee, the votes should in either case be taken by orders; and the concurrent assent of Bishops, Clergy, and Laity should be necessary for any legislative action, wherever the Clergy and Laity form part of the constitution of a Provincial Synod; such powers and functions not involving legislation being reserved as belong to the Bishops by virtue of their office.

The number, qualification, and mode of election of the Clerical and Lay Representatives from each Diocese must be determined by the Synods in the several Provinces.

It is the office of the Provincial Synod, generally, to exercise, within the limits of the Province, powers in regard to Provincial questions similar to those which the Diocesan Synod exercises, within the Diocese, in regard to Diocesan questions.

As to the relation between these two Synods, your Committee are of opinion that the Diocese is bound to accept positive enactments of a Provincial Synod in which it is duly represented, and that no Diocesan regulations have force, if contrary to the decisions of a higher Synod; but that, in order to prevent any collision or misunderstanding, the spheres of action of the several Synods should be defined on the following principle, viz., That the Provincial Synod should deal with questions of common interest to the whole Province, and with those which affect the communion of the Dioceses with one another and with the rest of the Church; whilst the Diocesan Synod should be left free to dispose of matters of local interest, and to manage the affairs of the Diocese.

From this principle your Committee draws the following conclusions:—

1. All alterations in the Services of the Church, required by circumstances in the Province, should be made or authorised by the Provincial Synod, and not merely by the Diocesan.

2. The rule of discipline for the Clergy of the Province should be framed by the Provincial Synod.

3. Rules for the trial of Clergy should be made by the Provincial Synod; but, in default of such action on the part of the Synod, the Diocesan Synod should establish provisional rules for this purpose. The Provincial Tribunal of Appeal should be established by the Provincial Synod.

4. In questions relating to Patronage, the tenure of Church property, Parochial divisions, arrangements, officers, etc., there should be joint action of the Diocese and the Province; the former making such regulations as may be best suited to develop local resources, the latter providing against the admission of any principle inexpedient for the common interests of the Church.

5. The erection of a new Diocese within the limits of an existing Diocese should proceed by general rules established by the Provincial Synod.

6. The question of the election of a Bishop it is unnecessary here to consider, as it is submitted to another Committee.[1]

III. The question of a higher Synod of the Anglican Communion, and of the relation which the inferior Synods should hold towards it, whenever it might assemble, is one, your Committee are aware, of much greater difficulty than any of those which have been previously considered.

The fact, however, that a Conference of Bishops of the whole Anglican Communion has already met together, is of itself an indication of the need which is generally felt of united counsel in a sphere more extensive than that of a Provincial Synod. Indeed, the Resolutions under which this Committee was appointed contemplate the possibility at least of some Synod being established superior to the Provincial. It is also implied in Resolution VIII. of this Conference,[2] that some such Assembly may be required, in order to preserve Colonial and Missionary Churches in close union with the Church of England, since it is provided that all changes in the Services of the Church made by one of their Provincial Synods should "be liable to revision by any Synod of the Anglican Communion in which the said Province should be represented."

The objection that may be urged against the united action of Churches which are more or less free to act independently, and other Churches whose constitution is fixed, not only by ancient ecclesiastical laws and usages, but by the law of the State, are

[1] See p. 67. [2] See p. 56.

obvious; but it appears to your Committee that the action of this Conference has proved that the difficulties which are anticipated are not insuperable, and suggests the method by which they may be overcome. Under present circumstances, indeed, no Assembly that might be convened would be competent to enact canons of binding ecclesiastical authority on these different bodies, or to frame definitions of faith which it would be obligatory on the Churches of the Anglican Communion to accept. It would be necessary, therefore, in the judgment of your Committee, to avoid all terms respecting this Assembly that might imply authority of this nature, and to call it a Congress, if even the term Council should be considered open to objection. Its decisions could only possess the authority which might be derived from the moral weight of such united counsels and judgments, and from the voluntary acceptance of its conclusions by any of the Churches there represented.

Your Committee consider that his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, as occupying the See from which the Colonial and American Churches derive their succession, should be the convener of such an Assembly. That it should differ from the present Conference in being attended by both Clerical and Lay Representatives of the several Churches, as consultees and advisers, each Diocese being allowed to send, besides its Bishop, a presbyter and a lay member of the Church, if they should desire to be thus represented; and further, in the proceedings being more formal and, in part at least, public. The question when for the first time, and at what periods, this Congress or Council should be called, your Committee deem it more respectful to leave for the consideration of his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury and of the present Conference.

G. A. New Zealand, *Chairman.*
H. Grahamstown, *Secretary.*

B.—*Report of the Committee appointed under Resolution IX. of the Lambeth Conference, on the Constitution of a voluntary spiritual Tribunal, to which questions of Doctrine may be carried by Appeal from the Tribunals for the exercise of discipline in each Province of the Colonial Church.*[1]

After full consideration of objections that have been urged against the establishment of any such Tribunal as that contem-

[1] Resolution IX.—"That the Committee appointed by Resolution V., with the addition of the names of the Bishops of London, St. David's, and Oxford, and all the Colonial Bishops, be instructed to consider the constitution of a voluntary spiritual Tribunal, to which questions of doctrine may be carried by appeal from the Tribunals for the exercise

plated by this Resolution, your Committee are of opinion that these objections are not sufficient to outweigh the arguments in its favour, and that most of the objections will be found inapplicable to the particular form of Tribunal which the Committee recommend.

Your Committee consider that such a Tribunal is required in order to prevent the dissatisfaction which would arise if important questions were finally decided by those Colonial Churches, the circumstances of which render it impossible for them to form a sufficient Tribunal of last resort.

It would also tend to secure unity in matters of Faith, and uniformity in matters of Discipline, where Doctrine may be involved.

For these reasons your Committee recommend that such a Tribunal be established; and from the desire expressed by several branches of the Colonial Church, that this should be one of the results of this Conference, they believe that it will be generally accepted by those for whose benefit it is designed.

At the same time, they are sensible of the great difficulty of forming such a Tribunal, and of the necessity of proceeding with caution, lest it should interfere with the liberties of the Colonial Churches, or should have any appearance of collision with the Courts established by law, either here or in Her Majesty's foreign possessions.

Your Committee now proceed to lay before the Conference their conclusions as to the functions and constitution of the proposed Tribunal.

They are of opinion that it should not take cognizance of any case which shall not have been referred to it by some branch of the Anglican Communion which has consented to its constitution. Thus it would not interfere either with those Churches in which provision is made by the State for the exercise of discipline, or with the liberty and rights of ecclesiastical Provinces. These would be free to accept or to decline the appeal thus offered to them, and to withdraw afterwards their acceptance of the Tribunal, if they should so desire.[1]

Your Committee consider that this Tribunal of Appeal should take into consideration all the facts of the case as sent up to it in writing from the inferior Tribunal; that the Appeal, however, should not be on the facts, but only on the points of Doctrine and Discipline involved in them.

That during the Appeal the sentence of the Provincial Tribunal

of discipline in each Province of the Colonial Church, and that their report be forwarded to his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, who is requested to communicate it to an adjourned meeting of this Conference." (See pp. 10 and 77.)

[1] The decisions of such a Tribunal would be of the same nature as those of "arbitrators, whose jurisdiction rests entirely upon the agreement of the parties." (Judgment of Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in case of Long *v.* Bishop of Capetown, 1 Moore, P.C.C., N.S., 462.)

should continue in force, so far as it affects the present exercise of spiritual functions by the accused.

That the judgments of the Tribunal of Appeal should be delivered in the form of a decision that the teaching or practice of the accused party is (or is not) permissible.

That the Tribunal should use as the standards of faith and doctrine by which its decisions shall be governed, those which are now in use in the United Church of England and Ireland; and that as to all matters not defined in such formularies, the judgments should be framed on any conclusions which shall be hereafter agreed to at any Council or Congress of the whole Anglican Communion: Provided always, that no such conclusion be contradictory to any now existing standard or formulary of the Church of England; and provided further, that the Synod of that Province of the Church from which the Appeal shall be sent, shall not have refused to accept such conclusion.

Your Committee further recommend, subject to any regulations that may be made at any future Conference of the Anglican Communion:—

That, as it is a Tribunal for decisions in matters of faith, Archbishops and Bishops only should be judges, his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury being the President.

That each Province in the Colonial Church should have the right of electing two members of the Tribunal; and that all the Dioceses of the Colonial Church not associated into Provinces should collectively have the right of electing two. That each Province of the United Church of England and Ireland should be requested to elect two members, but that the Province of Canterbury should elect three, in the event of his Grace the Archbishop not acting as President. That the Episcopal Church in Scotland should have the right of electing two. And (as it appears probable that the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States would avail itself of such a Tribunal) that Church should have the right of electing five members.

In the judgment of the Committee, the Bishops of the several Churches should elect those who shall represent them on this Tribunal.

That, so soon after January 1st, 1869, as any ten names shall have been forwarded to the Archbishop of Canterbury as having been elected, the Tribunal should be deemed to be constituted.

That of the members thus elected, seven should form a quorum for the transaction of business, but a smaller number should have power to adjourn from time to time.

That the members of the Tribunal should continue in office, unless their seat be vacated by death, resignation, or removal of the electing body; but that, in the event of any Bishop of the

Colonial Church or American Church notifying to the electing body that he is unable or declines to attend at any sitting of the Tribunal to which he may be summoned, it should be lawful for the body by which he was elected to appoint, instead of him, any Bishop of the Anglican Communion other than one of those already elected.

That, in the event of the Archbishop of Canterbury for the time being declining or being unable to act as President, it should be lawful for his Grace, if he should see fit, to nominate any other member of the Tribunal to act as President in his room; and in the event of no such appointment being made by him, that it should be lawful for the Tribunal at its first meeting to elect one of its members as President.

That the summons for the sitting of the Tribunal should be issued within thirty days from the time of the notice of Appeal being delivered by the agent of the Appellant to the proper officer of the Tribunal.

That the action of the Tribunal should not be impeded by the absence from it of any of those who are at liberty to sit in it, provided there be a quorum.

That, before the assembling of the Tribunal for the hearing of an Appeal, the President should nominate as Assessors three theologians and three persons learned in the law, who should be present at the trial, and should answer any questions as to theological learning and law put to them by the Tribunal through its President in writing, and should be at liberty to tender in writing to the Tribunal through its President their opinion upon any point of theological learning or law which may arise, and that the Tribunal should be bound to consider such opinion before coming to its decision.

That parties before the Tribunal may be represented by any counsel they may select, whether theologians or persons learned in the law.

That the rules of procedure of the said Tribunal, except as here provided for, should, as far as possible, be those of the higher Courts of Law, and that any necessary alterations in such rules should be made by the Tribunal itself.

That no sentence should be passed without the assent thereto of two-thirds of the Judges present during the trial.

That, at the time of delivering judgment, each member of the Tribunal who has been present during the trial should give his decision in writing, and may read, or cause to be read, openly in Court his decision, and the reasons for it; and that the judgment of the prescribed majority should be the judgment of the Tribunal.

F. Montreal, *Chairman.*

H. Grahamstown, *Secretary.*

C.—*On the Courts of Metropolitans, and the Trial of a Bishop or Metropolitan.*[1]

I. Your Committee consider that the constitution of the Provincial Tribunal for Appeals from the decisions of Diocesan Tribunals should be determined, whenever it is not fixed by law, by the Synod of the Province; but it is expedient, in their judgment, that its rules should be assimilated, as far as circumstances will admit, to those of the proposed tribunal of Appeal in England.

II. In the case of charges against a Bishop, they suggest the following as general principles:—

That each Province should determine by rules made in its own Synod the offences for which a Bishop may be presented for trial, and who should be promoters of the charge.

That the charge should be presented to the Metropolitan.

That it appears doubtful whether a preliminary inquiry is expedient, provided that sufficient precautions are taken that no frivolous charges should be entertained.

That the Metropolitan should summon to the hearing of the cause all the Bishops of the Province (except the accused), who should sit as judges, not merely as assessors.

That no trial should take place, except before two-thirds of the Bishops of the Province, provided that there be never fewer than three Bishops present, including the Metropolitan.

That if three Bishops of the Province should be unable to attend, it should be lawful for the Metropolitan to call in one or more Bishops not of the Province.

That it is desirable that, whenever it may be practicable, there should be Assessors, as recommended by this Committee for the higher Tribunal of Appeal.

That, in case of the non-appearance of the accused after sufficient citations, the trial may go forward as if he were present, or he may be punished for contumacy, according as the Province may prescribe.

That there should be no sentence except by the judgment of two-thirds of the Tribunal, or by three judges, whichever should be the greater number; the assent of the Metropolitan not being necessary to the sentence.

That the general rules of procedure should be framed by the Synod of the Province; but should be, as far as possible, similar

[1] Resolution X.—"That the Resolutions submitted to this Conference relative to the discipline to be exercised by the Metropolitans, the Court of Metropolitans, the scheme for conducting the Election of Bishops, when not otherwise provided for, the declaration of submission to the Regulation of Synods, and the question of what Legislation should be proposed for the Colonial Churches, be referred to the Committee specified in the preceding Resolution."

to those recommended by this Committee for the proposed Tribunal of Appeal.

That an appeal to the higher Tribunal recommended by this Committee should be allowed when the case is one of doctrine, if notice of such appeal be given within days from the delivery of sentence; and that, in all cases, proper provision should be made for a new trial on sufficient reason being shown.

That there should be no contract not to appeal to Civil Courts; but that sufficient provision should be made by the Declaration of Submission (to be considered in another Report) that the sentence of the Spiritual Tribunals may be effective.

That a Metropolitan should be tried in the same manner as any other Bishop—the senior Bishop, in that case, acting in the place of the Metropolitan.

F. MONTREAL, *Chairman.*
H. GRAHAMSTOWN, *Secretary.*

D.—*Scheme for conducting the Election of Bishops, when not otherwise provided for.*

Your Committee have to consider the proper mode for conducting the election of a Bishop, whenever it is not provided for by an existing law, and without reference to any question that might arise as to the temporalities connected with the See.

It is evident that there are two parties whose concurrent action is necessary in such an appointment—viz., the Clergy and Laity of the Diocese, and the Bishops of the Province by whom the person elected as Bishop is consecrated.

Your Committee are of opinion that, in accordance with the ancient usages of the Church, the election as a general rule should be made by the Diocese, and that the Bishops of the Province should confirm the election. They consider, however, that it is consistent with this principle that the Diocese should nominate two or more persons, of whom the Bishops of the Province should select one; or that the Diocese should delegate to any person or body the power of choosing a Bishop for the vacant See, it being understood that the Diocese must accept such choice as final.

The principle of the concurrent action of the two parties concerned would also be preserved if the Bishops of the Province should nominate two or more persons, from whom the Diocese should elect one.

In the election by the Diocese it appears to ycur Committee that the right of selecting the person who shall be their Bishop belongs to the Clergy, the Laity having the right of accepting or rejecting

the person so chosen. But it is expedient, in their judgment, that the election should always be made by the Diocesan Synod, wherever one is established, and in accordance with the rules of that Synod. In those Dioceses in which there is no Diocesan Synod, they recommend that, for the election of a Bishop, a Convention should be summoned by the Dean, senior Archdeacon, or senior Presbyter of the Diocese; that this Convention should consist of all Presbyters and of lay-representatives, who should be male communicants of at least twenty-one years of age; that these representatives should be elected by each parish or congregation, in such manner as should be determined by the convener; that the person who should obtain the majority of votes of the Clergy, and also of those of the lay-representatives present at the Convention, should be accounted to be elected to the Bishopric; that this election should not be vitiated by the absence of any of the parties summoned, or by the failure of any congregation or parish to elect a lay-representative; that any question as to the validity of the election to the vacant See should be submitted, prior to the Consecration, to the Consecrating Bishops, whose decision should be final; and that after the consecration of a Bishop no objection should be entertained.

They further recommend that, where the Diocese is included in a Province, the confirmation of an election should be by the Metropolitan and a majority of the Bishops of the Province; but where the Diocese is extra-Provincial, that the confirmation should rest with the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the Bishop of London; that the power of confirmation should be absolute—the Bishops having the right to refuse to confirm the election, without assigning any reason for their refusal.

All further rules necessary for conducting the election should, in the opinion of your Committee, be made by the Synod of the Province.

F. Montreal, *Chairman.*

H. Grahamstown, *Secretary.*

E.—*On Declaration of Submission to Regulations of Synod.*

Your Committee recommend that, in all branches of the Church, the government of which is not determined by law, a Declaration should be made by those who hold office therein. They consider that a Declaration is necessary, in order to define the conditions of the consensual compact, and that it should be framed so as to secure submission to all synodical action in its legitimate sphere, and to the decisions of the constituted Tribunals.

They recommend the following declaration to be made before the Metropolitan, or some person duly appointed by him, by all Bishops elect, either before their consecration, or, if already consecrated, before exercising any Episcopal functions in their Diocese:—

"I *A. B.*, chosen Bishop of the Church and See of , do promise that I will teach and maintain the doctrine and discipline of the United Church of England and Ireland, as acknowledged and received by the Province of , and I also do declare that I consent to be bound by all the rules and regulations which have heretofore been made or which may from time to time be made, by the Synod of the Diocese of , and the Provincial Synod of , or either of them; and, in consideration of being appointed Bishop of the said Church or See of , I hereby undertake immediately to resign the said appointment, together with all the rights and emoluments appertaining thereto, if sentence requiring such resignation should at any time be passed upon me, after due examination had, by the Tribunal acknowledged by the Synod of the said Province for the trial of a Bishop; saving all rights of Appeal allowed by the said Synod."

They recommend that the following Declaration be made (in addition to the Declaration required by the rules of that Province or Diocese as to doctrine and worship) by persons to be admitted to holy orders, and by Clergymen to be admitted to the cure of souls, or to any other office of trust in the Church:—

"I, *A. B.*, do declare that I consent to be bound by all the rules and regulations which have heretofore been made, or which may from time to time be made, by the Synod of the Diocese of , and the Provincial Synod of , or either of them; [and in consideration of being appointed , I hereby undertake immediately to resign the said appointment, together with all the rights and emoluments appertaining thereto, if sentence requiring such resignation should at any time be passed upon me, after due examination had, by the Tribunal appointed by the Synods of the aforesaid Province and Diocese for the trial of a Clergyman; saving all rights of Appeal allowed by the said Synod]."

(The part in brackets to be omitted when there is no appointment to a cure of souls, or office of trust.)

Your Committee consider that it must be left to the Province or Diocese to decide whether laymen who are admitted to any office or position of trust should be required to sign a Declaration of the same nature.

G. A. New Zealand, *Chairman.*
H. Grahamstown, *Secretary.*

F.—*On Provinces and Subordination to Metropolitans.*

On this subject your Committee beg to report as follows:—

They are of opinion that the association or federation of Dioceses within certain territorial limits, commonly called an Ecclesiastical Province, is not only in accordance with the ancient laws and usages of the Christian Church, but is essential to its complete organisation.

Such an association is of the highest advantage for united action, for the exercise of discipline, for the confirmation of the election of Bishops, and generally to enable the Church to adapt its laws to the circumstances of the countries in which it is planted.

It is expedient, in the judgment of your Committee, that these ecclesiastical divisions should, as far as possible, follow the civil divisions of these countries.

Of the Bishops of these Dioceses thus associated, one, in conformity with ancient usage, ought to be Metropolitan or Primus, the functions and powers of the Metropolitan being determined by synodical action in the Province, except so far as Metropolitical powers are defined by undisputed General Councils of the Church.

It seems to your Committee most in accordance with primitive usage that the Metropolitical See should be fixed, but they do not deem this to be essential. It appears expedient that the Provincial Synod should have the power of changing, when necessary, the site of the Metropolitical See.

Your Committee do not consider it necessary that the election to the Metropolitical See should be conducted differently from the election to other vacant sees; since the Bishops of the Province possess the right of confirming or refusing to confirm any election.

Your Committee strongly recommend that all those Dioceses which are not as yet gathered into Provinces should, as soon as possible, form part of some Provincial organisation. The particular mode of effecting this in each case must be determined by those who are concerned.

It is sufficient for your Committee to point out that the steps to be taken for effecting this change are twofold, since the relations of the Dioceses in Provincial organisation, when complete, are formed on the one hand by the subordination of the Bishops of the Province to a Metropolitan, and on the other by the association of the Dioceses in Provincial action. Any alteration of existing arrangements would require, therefore, in the opinion of your Committee, the concurrent action of the Diocese which is to be gathered into a Province with other neighbouring Dioceses, and of his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, to whom the Bishops of the Dioceses that at present are extra-provincial have taken the oath of canonical obedience. In the case of the limits of an

existing Province being altered, the consent of the Synod of that Province would be required for the alteration.

F. Montreal, *Chairman.*
H. Grahamstown, *Secretary.*

G.—*Report of the Committee appointed under Resolution XI. of the Lambeth Conference.*[1]

Your Committee report that, after full consideration of the questions referred to them by the Conference, they have adopted the following Resolutions:—

I. That every branch of the Church is entitled to found a Missionary Bishopric.

II. That it is desirable that each branch of the Church should act upon rules agreed upon beforehand by the Synod or other Church Council of the said branch.

III. That each Missionary Bishopric should be deemed to be attached to one branch of the Church, and that all rules for the election of a Missionary Bishop, and for the formation of a Diocese or Dioceses out of the Missionary District, should be made by the Synod or other Church Council of such branch of the Church.

IV. That notice of the erection of any Missionary Bishopric, and the choice and consecration of the Bishop, should be notified to all Archbishops and Metropolitans, and all Presiding Bishops, of the Anglican Communion.

V. That in appointing a Missionary Bishop, the district within which he is to exercise his Mission should be defined as far as possible; and that no other Bishop should be sent within the same district, without previous communication with that branch of the Church which gave mission for the work.

VI. That, while peculiar cases may occur in Missionary work, owing to difference of race and language, in which it may be desirable that more than one Bishop should exercise episcopal functions within the same district, the Committee consider that such cases should be regarded as exceptions, justified only by special circumstances.

VII. That, with respect to the special case of Continental Chaplaincies, the Committee suggest to the Conference the consideration of some ecclesiastical arrangement by which the various congregations of the Anglican Communion may be under one authority, whether of the English or American Church.

[1] Resolution XI.—"That a special Committee be appointed to consider the Resolutions relative to the notification of proposed Missionary Bishoprics, and the subordination of Missionaries."

VIII. That the conditions on which a Missionary Bishopric should be brought within a Provincial organisation should be:—

1. The request of the Missionary Bishop, addressed both to the Church from which he received mission and to the Province which he wishes to join.

2. The consent of the Church from which he received mission, that consent being given by the Metropolitan or Presiding Bishop.

3. The consent of the Province he wishes to join, that consent being given by the Provincial Synod.

IX. That the status, jurisdiction, and designation of the Bishop thus received into a system of Provincial organisation should be determined by the Synod of the Province to which his Bishopric shall be then attached.

X. That, as a general rule, it is expedient that such Missionary Bishopric should be attached to the nearest Province; but that in certain cases it may be necessary that some more remote Province should be selected.

Bishop Tozer's Mission is a case to which the Committee desire to draw the attention of the Conference, as being one in which, for the present, Provincial organisation would seem to be impracticable, from the isolation of the district in which Bishop Tozer exercises his episcopal functions, and its remoteness from the Province of South Africa.

XI. That Missionary Bishops and their Clergy should be bound generally to the Canons of Doctrine and Discipline of the Church from which their mission is derived, or to which they may have been united, and that all alterations in matters of discipline be communicated to the authorities of that Church.

XII. That when a Missionary Church shall be received into the organisation of a Provincial Synod, the said Church should be bound by the acts of that body; but that, in order to effect this, the Missionary Church should be granted a power of representation, or of vote by proxy, in such Synod.

XIII. That, as a general rule, in conformity with Church order, all Missionaries and Chaplains residing or engaged in the exercise of ministerial duty within the Diocese or District of a Colonial or Missionary Bishop, should be licensed by, and be subject to the authority of the said Bishop.

XIV. That every Clergyman removing from one Colonial or Missionary Diocese or District into another Diocese ought to carry with him Letters Testimonial from the Colonial or Missionary Bishop whose Diocese or District he is leaving.

XV. That no person admitted to Holy Orders by the Bishop of any Diocese in England or Ireland, who shall afterwards have been serving under the jurisdiction of any Scottish, Colonial, or Foreign Bishop, should be received into any of the Home Dioceses, without

producing letters Dimissory or Commendatory from the Scottish, Colonial, or Foreign Bishop in whose Diocese he has been serving.

XVI. The attention of this Committee has been called to the clause in the Paper of Arrangements for the Conference, headed "Subordination of Missionaries." The Committee have failed to understand what is meant by the words "instructions from those in authority at home," but they can recommend no scheme which interferes with the canonical relation which subsists between a Bishop and his clergy.

W. J. GIBRALTAR, *Chairman.*

WILLIAM GEORGE TOZER, Missionary Bishop, *Secretary.*

H.—*Report of the Committee appointed under Resolution VI. of the Lambeth Conference.*[1]

By the Resolution of the Lambeth Conference two questions were referred to the Committee:—

I. How may the Church be delivered from a continuance of the scandal now existing in Natal?

II. How may the true faith be maintained?

I. On the first question, the Committee recommend that an Address be made to the Colonial Bishoprics Council, calling their attention to the fact that they are paying an annual stipend to a Bishop lying under the imputation of heretical teaching, and praying them to take the best legal opinion as to there being any, and if so what, mode of laying these allegations before some competent court, and if any mode be pointed out, then to proceed accordingly for the removal of this scandal.

The Committee also recommend that the Address to the Colonial Bishoprics Council be prefaced with the following statement:—

"That, whilst we accept the spiritual validity of the sentence of deposition pronounced by the Metropolitan and Bishops of the South African Church upon Dr. Colenso, we consider it of the utmost moment for removing the existing scandal from the English Communion that there should be pronounced by some competent English court such a legal sentence on the errors of the said Dr. Colenso as would warrant the Colonial Bishoprics Council in ceasing

[1] Resolution VI.—"That, in the judgment of the Bishops now assembled, the whole Anglican Communion is deeply injured by the present condition of the Church in Natal: and that a Committee be now appointed at this General Meeting to report on the best mode by which the Church may be delivered from a continuance of this scandal, and the true faith maintained. That such Report shall be forwarded to his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, with the request that he will be pleased to transmit the same to all the Bishops of the Anglican Communion, and to ask for their judgment thereupon." (See above, pp. 10 and 12).

to pay his stipend, and would justify an appeal to the Crown to cancel his Letters Patent."

II. On the second question:

"How may the true faith be maintained in Natal?"

The Committee submit the following Report:—

That they did not consider themselves instructed by the Conference, and therefore did not consider themselves competent, to inquire into the whole case; but that their conclusions are based upon the following facts:—

1. That in the year 1863, *forty-one* Bishops concurred in an Address to Bishop Colenso, urging him to resign his Bishopric.

2. That in the year 1863, some of the publications of Dr. Colenso, viz., "The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua Critically Examined," Parts I. and II., were condemned by the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury.

3. That the Bishop of Capetown, by virtue of his Letters Patent as Metropolitan, might have visited Dr. Colenso with summary jurisdiction, and might have taken out of his hands the management of the Diocese of Natal.

4. That the Bishop of Capetown, instead of proceeding summarily, instituted judicial proceedings, having reason to believe himself to be competent to do so.

That he summoned Dr. Colenso before himself and suffragans.

That Dr. Colenso appeared by his proctor.

That his defence was heard and judged to be insufficient to purge him from the heresy.

That, after sentence was pronounced, Dr. Colenso was offered an appeal to the Archbishop of Canterbury, as provided in the Metropolitan's Letters Patent.

5. That this Act of the African Church was approved—

By the Convocation of Canterbury;

By the Convocation of York;

By the General Convention of the Episcopal Church in the United States, in 1865;

By the Episcopal Synod of the Church in Scotland;

By the Provincial Synod of the Church in Canada, in the year 1865;

And, finally, the spiritual validity of the sentence of deposition was accepted by *fifty-six* Bishops on the occasion of the Lambeth Conference.

Judging, therefore, that the See is spiritually vacant; and learning, by the evidence brought before them, that there are many members of the Church who are unable to accept the ministrations of Dr. Colenso, the Committee deem it to be the duty of the Metropolitan and other Bishops of South Africa to proceed, upon the election of the Clergy and Laity in Natal, to consecrate one to discharge those spiritual functions of which these members of the Church are now in want.

In forwarding their Report to his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, as instructed by the Resolution of the Conference, the Committee request his Grace to communicate the same to the adjourned meeting of the Conference, to be holden at Lambeth on the tenth day of the present month.

G. A. NEW ZEALAND, *Convener.*

December 9th, 1867.

J.—*Form of Letters Dimissory for the Clergy.*[1]

To the Right Reverend the Bishops and Reverend the Clergy, and to the faithful in Christ of the Diocese of A. We, B, by Divine permission Bishop of C, send greeting in the Lord.

We commend to your brotherly kindness by these our letters, D, E, Priest (or Deacon) of our Diocese, beseeching you to receive him in the Lord as a brother sound in the Faith, of a well-ordered and Religious Life, and worthy of all Christian Fellowship, and to render him any assistance of which he may stand in need; and so we bid you farewell in Christ our Lord.

Witness our hand.

A, *Bishop.*

B, *Secretary.*

[1] See p. 54.

IV.

Resolutions of the Adjourned Conference, December 10th, 1867. (See page 12.)

Resolution I.—"That this adjourned meeting of the Conference receives the Report (A) of the Committee now presented, and directs the publication thereof, commending it to the careful consideration of the Bishops of the Anglican Communion, as containing the result of the deliberations of that Committee; and returns the members of the same its thanks for the care with which they have considered the various important questions referred to them."

(The same Resolution was passed with reference to Reports B, C, D, E, F, G.)

Resolution II.—"That the Report (H) of the Committee appointed under Resolution VI., laid before this meeting by his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, be received and printed; that the thanks of this meeting be given to the Committee for their labours; and that his Grace be requested to communicate the Report to the Council of the Colonial Bishoprics Fund."

Resolution III.—"That his Grace be requested, if applied to by the House of Bishops in the Episcopal Church in the United States of America, to allow a copy of the Records of the Conference to be made for them, and to be lodged in the hands of such officer as shall be designated by the House of Bishops to receive it, for reference by Bishops only, but not for publication."

Resolution IV.—"That his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury be requested to convey to the Church in Russia an expression of the sympathy of the Anglican Communion with that Church, in the loss which it has sustained by the death of his Eminence Philarete, the venerable Metropolitan of Moscow."

Resolution V.—"That the thanks of this Conference be given to the Bishop of Grahamstown [1] for the valuable services which he has rendered as Secretary to many of the Committees appointed by the Conference."

Resolution VI.—"That the thanks of this Conference be given

[1] Right Rev. Bishop Cotterill.

to Philip Wright, Esq., and to Isambard Brunel, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, for their aid as Assistant Secretaries to the Committees; and especially to the latter for his valuable assistance in all matters that required legal advice."

Resolution VII.—" That we cannot close this Conference without conveying our hearty thanks to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, both for convening this meeting, and for the mode in which he has presided over its deliberations."

Besides the preceding Resolutions :—

(1) The President reported that he had been authorised to annex the following signatures to the Encyclical Letter :—

A. T. Cicestr.
Auckland Bath and Wells.
Robert Down and Connor.
William Derry.
Edward Newfoundland.
J. Fredericton.
T. E. St. Helena. (See page 13.)

(2) The following Bishops were appointed as a Sub-Committee, for the purpose of drawing up a Bill, in accordance with a Report submitted by the Committee appointed under Resolution IX. of the previous meeting :—

Bishop of London.
,, Oxford.
,, Lincoln.
,, Ely.
,, Lichfield (Elect).
,, Montreal.
,, Grahamstown.
Bishop Trower. (See page 62.)

(3) His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury laid on the table a form of Letters Dimissory,[1] which he had prepared, in accordance with Resolution II.[2] of the last session of the Lambeth Conference.

(4) The Bishop of Illinois, at the request of the Conference, stated that the Meeting of the Triennial General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States would be held on the first Wednesday of October next, in the City of New York; and, in behalf of the Church in the United States, offered an affectionate invitation to the Bishops of the Conference to be present on that occasion; and also expressed the hope that the different branches of the Anglican Communion would depute one or more Bishops as Representatives of the Mother and Colonial

[1] See p. 75. [2] See p. 54.

Churches, to be present on that occasion, assuring all that might accept this invitation of cordial welcome and affectionate brotherhood.

(5) At the request of the Conference, the Bishop of Lichfield (Elect) undertook the office of Corresponding Secretary for the Bishops of the Anglican Communion.

His Grace the President then pronounced the Benediction, and the Conference was closed.

V.

Official List of the Bishops Present at the Lambeth Conference of 1878. (See pp. 19 and 25.)

ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.
ARCHBISHOP OF YORK.
ARCHBISHOP OF ARMAGH.
ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN.

BISHOP OF LONDON.
BISHOP OF WINCHESTER.
BISHOP OF LLANDAFF.
BISHOP OF RIPON.
BISHOP OF NORWICH.
BISHOP OF BANGOR.
BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER & BRISTOL.
BISHOP OF CHESTER.
BISHOP OF ST. ALBANS.
BISHOP OF HEREFORD.
BISHOP OF PETERBOROUGH.
BISHOP OF LINCOLN.
BISHOP OF SALISBURY.
BISHOP OF CARLISLE.
BISHOP OF EXETER.
BISHOP OF BATH & WELLS.
BISHOP OF OXFORD.
BISHOP OF MANCHESTER.
BISHOP OF CHICHESTER.
BISHOP OF ST. ASAPH.
BISHOP OF ELY.
BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S.
BISHOP OF TRURO.
BISHOP OF ROCHESTER.
BISHOP OF LICHFIELD.
BISHOP OF SODOR & MAN.
BISHOP OF MEATH.
BISHOP OF DOWN.

Bishop of Killaloe.
Bishop of Limerick.
Bishop of Derry.
Bishop of Cashel.
Bishop of Ossory.

Bishop of Moray. Primus.
Bishop of St. Andrew's.
Bishop of Edinburgh.
Bishop of Aberdeen.
Bishop of Glasgow.
Bishop of Brechin.
Bishop of Argyll.

Bishop of Delaware.
Bishop of New York.
Bishop of Ohio.
Bishop of Pennsylvania.
Bishop of Western New York.
Bishop of Nebraska.
Bishop of Pittsburgh.
Bishop of Louisiana.
Bishop of Missouri.
Bishop of Long Island.
Bishop of Albany.
Bishop of Central Pennsylvania.
Assistant Bishop of North Carolina.
Bishop of New Jersey.
Bishop of Wisconsin.
Bishop of Iowa.
Bishop of Colorado.

Bishop of Haiti.
Bishop of Shanghai.

Bishop of Montreal. Metropolitan.
Bishop of Fredericton.
Bishop of Nova Scotia.
Bishop of Ontario.
Bishop of Huron.
Bishop of Toronto.
Bishop of Niagara.

Bishop of Madras.
Bishop of Colombo.
Bishop of Bombay.

Bishop of Guiana.
Bishop of Kingston.
Bishop of Antigua.
Bishop of Barbados.
Bishop of Nassau.

Bishop of Sydney. Metropolitan.
Bishop of Adelaide.
Bishop of North Queensland.

Bishop of Christchurch. Metropolitan.
Bishop of Dunedin.

Bishop of Gibraltar.

Bishop of Capetown. Metropolitan.
Bishop of St. Helena.
Bishop of Maritzburgh.
Bishop of Bloemfontein.
Bishop of Pretoria.

Bishop of Rupertsland. Metropolitan.
Bishop of British Columbia.
Bishop of Saskatchewan.

Bishop of the Falkland Islands.

Bishop Suffragan of Dover.
Bishop Suffragan of Guildford.
Bishop Suffragan of Nottingham.

Bishop Perry.
Bishop McDougall.
Bishop Ryan.
Bishop Claughton.

Officers of the Conference.

The Bishop of Gloucester & Bristol,
Secretary of the Conference.

The Bishop of Edinburgh,
Secretary of Committees.

Isambard Brunel, D.C.L., Chancellor of the Diocese of Ely, } *Assistant Secretary.*

VI.

Encyclical Letter of 1878. (See p. 24.)

To the faithful in Christ Jesus, greeting—

We, Archbishops, Bishops Metropolitan, and other Bishops of the Holy Catholic Church, in full communion with the Church of England, one hundred in number, all exercising superintendence over Dioceses, or lawfully commissioned to exercise Episcopal functions therein, assembled, many of us from the most distant parts of the earth, at Lambeth Palace, in the year of our Lord 1878, under the presidency of the most reverend Archibald Campbell, by Divine Providence Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England; after receiving, in the private Chapel of the said Palace, the blessed Sacrament of the Lord's Body and Blood, and after having united in prayer for the guidance of the Holy Spirit, have taken into our consideration various definite questions submitted to us affecting the condition of the Church in divers parts of the world.

We have made these questions the subject of serious deliberation for many days, and we now commend to the faithful the conclusions which have been adopted.

1. *Report of Committee on the best mode of maintaining union among the various Churches of the Anglican Communion.*

1.—In considering the best mode of maintaining union among the various Churches of our Communion, the Committee, first of all, recognise, with deep thankfulness to Almighty God, the essential and evident unity in which the Church of England and

the Churches in visible communion with her have always been bound together.[1] United under One Divine Head in the fellowship of the One Catholic and Apostolic Church, holding the One Faith revealed in Holy Writ, defined in the Creeds, and maintained by the Primitive Church, receiving the same Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as containing all things necessary to salvation—these Churches teach the same Word of God, partake of the same divinely-ordained Sacraments, through the ministry of the same Apostolic orders, and worship one God and Father through the same Lord Jesus Christ, by the same Holy and Divine Spirit, Who is given to those that believe, to guide them into all truth.

2.—Together with this unity, however, there has existed among these Churches that variety of custom, discipline, and form of worship which necessarily results from the exercise by each "particular or national Church" of its right "to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying." We gladly acknowledge that there is at present no real ground for anxiety on account of this diversity; but the desire has of late been largely felt and expressed, that some practical and efficient methods should be adopted, in order to guard against possible sources of disunion in the future, and at the same time further to manifest and cherish that true and substantial agreement which exists among these increasingly numerous Churches.

3.—The method which first naturally suggests itself is that which, originating with the inspired Apostles, long served to hold all the Churches of Christ in one undivided and visible communion. The assembling, however, of a true General Council, such as the Church of England has always declared her readiness to resort to, is, in the present condition of Christendom, unhappily but obviously impossible. The difficulties attending the assembling of a Synod of all the Anglican Churches, though different in character and less serious in nature, seem to us nevertheless too great to allow of our recommending it for present adoption.

4.—The experiment, now twice tried, of a Conference of Bishops called together by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and meeting under his presidency, offers at least the hope that the problem, hitherto unsolved, of combining together for consultation representatives of Churches so differently situated and administered, may find, in the providential course of events, its own solution.[2] Your Committee would, on this point, venture to suggest that such Conferences, called together from time to time by the Archbishop of Canterbury, at the request of, or in consultation with, the Bishops of our Communion, might with advantage be

[1] Note (A) page 98.

[2] Note (B) page 99.

invested in future with somewhat larger liberty as to the initiation and selection of subjects for discussion. For example, a Committee might be constituted, such as should represent, more or less completely, the several Churches of the Anglican Communion; and to this Committee it might be entrusted to draw up, after receiving communications from the Bishops, a scheme of subjects to be discussed.

5.—Meanwhile, there are certain principles of Church order which, your Committee consider, ought to be distinctly recognised and set forth, as of great importance for the maintenance of union among the Churches of our Communion.

(1.) First, that the duly-certified action of every national or particular Church, and of each ecclesiastical Province (or Diocese not included in a Province), in the exercise of its own discipline, should be respected by all the other Churches, and by their individual members.

(2.) Secondly, that when a Diocese, or territorial sphere of administration, has been constituted by the authority of any Church or Province of this Communion within its own limits, no Bishop or other clergyman of any other Church should exercise his functions within that Diocese without the consent of the Bishop thereof.[1]

(3.) Thirdly, that no Bishop should authorise to officiate in his Diocese a clergyman coming from another Church or Province, unless such clergyman present letters testimonial, countersigned by the Bishop of the Diocese from which he comes; such letters to be, as nearly as possible, in the form adopted by such Church or Province in the case of the transfer of a clergyman from one Diocese to another.

Passing to details, your Committee would call attention to the following points:—

I. *Of Church Organisation.*

6. Inasmuch as the sufficient and effective organisation of the several parts of the Church tends to promote the unity of the whole, your Committee would, with this view, repeat the recommendation in the sixth Report of the first Lambeth Conference,[2] that those Dioceses which still remain isolated should, as circumstances may allow, associate themselves into a Province or Provinces, in accordance with the ancient laws and usages of the Catholic Church.

[1] This does not refer to questions respecting missionary Bishops and foreign chaplaincies, which have been entrusted to other Committees.

[2] Note (C). page 101. See also p. 70.

II.—*Of Common Work.*

7.—Believing that the unity of our Churches will be especially manifested and strengthened by their uniting together in common work, your Committee would call attention to the great value of such co-operation wherever the opportunity shall present itself; as, for example, in founding and maintaining, in the missionary field, schools for the training of a native ministry, such as that which is now contemplated in Shanghai, and, generally, as far as may be possible, in prosecuting missionary work, such as that which the Churches in England and Scotland are maintaining together in Kaffraria.

III.—*Of Commendatory Letters.*

8.—(1.) This Committee would renew the recommendation of the first Lambeth Conference, that letters commendatory should be given by their own Bishops to clergymen visiting for a time other Churches than those to which they belong.

(2.) They would urge yet more emphatically the importance of letters commendatory being given by their own clergymen to members of their flocks going from one country to another. And they consider it desirable that the clergy should urge on such persons the duty of promptly presenting these letters, and should carefully instruct them as to the oneness of the Church in its Apostolical constitution under its varying organisation and conditions.

It may not, perhaps, be considered foreign to this subject to suggest here the importance of impressing upon our people the extent and geographical distribution of our Churches, and of reminding them, that there is now hardly any part of the world where members of our Communion may not find a Church one with their own in faith, order, and worship.

IV.—*Of circulating Information as to the Churches.*

9.—It appears that the want has been much felt of some centre of communication among the Churches in England, Ireland, Scotland, America, India, the Colonies, and elsewhere, through which ecclesiastical documents of importance might be mutually circulated, and in which copies of them might be retained for reference. Your Committee would suggest that the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge might be requested to maintain a department for this purpose, supported by special contributions; and also that provision might be made for the more general dissemination, in each Church, of information respecting the acts and current history

of all the rest. They recommend that the Reports and other proceedings of this Conference, which it may think fit to publish, should be communicated through this channel. They further think it desirable that the official Acts, and other published documents of each representative body of this Communion, should be interchanged among the respective Bishops and the officers of such bodies.

V.—*Of a Day of Intercession.*

10.—Remembering the blessing promised to united intercession, and believing that such intercession ever tends to deepen and strengthen that unity of His Church for which Our Lord earnestly pleaded in His great intercessory prayer, your Committee trust that this Conference will give the weight of its recommendation to the observance, throughout the Churches of this Communion, of a season of prayer for the unity of Christendom. This recommendation has been, to some extent, anticipated by the practice adopted of late years of setting apart a Day of Intercession for Missions. Your Committee would by no means wish to interfere with an observance which appears to have been widely accepted, and signally blessed of God. But, as our Divine Lord has so closely connected the unity of His followers with the world's belief in His own Mission from the Father, it seems to us that intercessions for the enlargement of His Kingdom may well be joined with earnest prayer that all who profess faith in Him may be one flock under one Shepherd. With respect to the day, your Committee have been informed that the Festival of St. Andrew, hitherto observed as the Day of Intercession for Missions, is found to be unsuitable to the circumstances of the Church in many parts of the world. They, therefore, venture to suggest that, after the present year, the time selected should be the Tuesday before Ascension Day (being a Rogation Day), or any of the seven days after that Tuesday; and they hope that all the Bishops of the several Churches will commend this observance to their respective Dioceses.

VI.—*Of Diversities in Worship.*

11.—Your Committee, believing that, next to oneness in "the Faith once delivered to the saints," communion in worship is the link which most firmly binds together bodies of Christian men, and remembering that the Book of Common Prayer, retained as it is, with some modifications, by all our Churches, has been one principal bond of union among them, desire to call attention to the fact that such communion in worship may be endangered by excessive diversities of ritual. They believe that the internal unity of the several Churches will help greatly to the union of these

one with another. And, while they consider that such large elasticity in the forms of worship is desirable as will give wide scope to all legitimate expressions of devotional feeling, they would appeal, on the other hand, to the Apostolic precept that "all things be done unto edifying," and to the Catholic principle that order and obedience, even at the sacrifice of personal preferences and tastes, lie at the foundation of Christian unity, and are even essential to the successful maintenance of the Faith.

12.—They cannot leave this subject without expressing an earnest hope that Churchmen of all views, however varying, will recognise the duty of submitting themselves, for conscience' sake, in matters ritual and ceremonial, to the authoritative judgments of that particular or national Church in which, by God's Providence, they may be placed; and that they will abstain from all that tends to estrangement or irritation, and will rather daily and fervently pray that the Holy Spirit may guide every member of the Church to "think and do always such things as be rightful," and that He may unite us all in that brotherly charity which is "the very bond of peace and of all virtues."

2. *Report of Committee on Voluntary Boards of Arbitration for Churches to which such an arrangement may be applicable.*

1.—Your Committee beg to submit the following Report:—

2.—The necessity for considering the subject which is entrusted to your Committee—namely, Voluntary Boards of Arbitration for Churches to which such an arrangement may be applicable—has arisen from the fact that there is no appeal from the Ecclesiastical Tribunals in the Colonial Churches to any of the ordinary Ecclesiastical Courts of England, or to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, when advising Her Majesty on appeals from Ecclesiastical Courts. No questions relating to the exercise of discipline in a Colonial Church can come before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, except on appeal from civil courts in the colony, exercising jurisdiction in matters affecting property or civil rights. The subject, therefore, before your Committee is not the constitution or jurisdiction of Provincial or Diocesan tribunals, but whether there should be some external tribunals, or "Voluntary Boards of Arbitration," to which an appeal or reference ought to be made; how such Boards, when necessary, should be constituted; and under what circumstances they should be approached.

3.—Your Committee, having taken into consideration the whole question, especially with reference to the action of some of the

Colonial Churches since 1867, when a Report [1] bearing upon this subject was prepared by a Committee of the Lambeth Conference held in that year, would make the following general recommendations:—

4.—I. (*a*) Every Ecclesiastical Province, which has constituted for the exercise of discipline over its clergy a tribunal for receiving appeals from its Diocesan Courts, should be held responsible for its own decisions in the exercise of such discipline; and your Committee are not prepared to recommend that there should be any one central tribunal of appeal from such Provincial tribunals.

5.—(*b*) If any Province is desirous that its tribunal of appeal should have power to obtain, in matters of doctrine, or of discipline involving a question of doctrine, the opinion of some council of reference before pronouncing sentence, your Committee consider that the conditions of such reference must be determined by the Province itself; but that the opinion of the council should be given on a consideration of the facts of the case, sent up to it in writing by the tribunal of appeal, and not merely on an abstract question of doctrine.

6.—(*c*) In Dioceses which have not yet been combined into a Province, or which may be geographically incapable of being so combined, your Committee recommend that appeals should lie from the Diocesan Courts to the Archbishop of Canterbury, to be heard by His Grace with such assistance as he may deem best. The circumstances of each Diocese must determine how such consensual jurisdiction could be enforced.

7.—II. As regards the very grave question of the trial of a Bishop, inasmuch as any tribunal, constituted for this purpose by a Province, is necessarily a tribunal of first instance, it would, in the opinion of your Committee, be expedient that, when any such provisions can be introduced by voluntary compact into the constitutions or canons of any Church, the following conditions should be observed:—

8.—(*a*) When any Bishop shall have been sentenced by the tribunal constituted for the trial of a Bishop in any Ecclesiastical Province, if no Bishop of the Province, other than the accused, shall dissent from the judgment, there should be no appeal; provided that the case be heard by not fewer than five Bishops, who shall be unanimous in their judgment.

9.—(*b*) If, in consequence of the small number of Bishops in a Province, or from any other sufficient cause, a tribunal of five comprovincial Bishops cannot be formed, your Committee would suggest that the Province should provide for the enlargement of the tribunal by the addition of Bishops from a neighbouring Province.

[1] See p. 62.

10.—(*c*) In the event of the Provincial tribunal not fulfilling the conditions indicated in paragraph 8 of this Report, your Committee would suggest that, whenever an external tribunal of appeal is not provided in the Canons of that Province, it should be in the power of the accused Bishop, if condemned, to require the Provincial tribunal to refer the case to at least five Metropolitans or chief Bishops of the Anglican Communion, to be named in the said Canons, of whom the Archbishop of Canterbury should be one; and that, if any three of these shall require that the case, or any portion of it, shall be re-heard or reviewed, it should be so re-heard or reviewed.

11.—(*d*) In cases in which an Ecclesiastical Province desires to have a tribunal of appeal from its Provincial tribunal for trying a Bishop, your Committee consider that such tribunal should consist of not less than five Bishops of the Churches of the Anglican Communion, under the presidency of the Archbishop of Canterbury, if His Grace will consent thereto, with the assistance of laymen learned in the law.

3. *Report of Committee on the relation to each other of Missionary Bishops and of Missionaries of various branches of the Anglican Communion, acting in the same country.*

1.—Your Committee beg to submit the following Report:—

I.

2.—Your Committee have had before them the question of providing Books of Common Prayer for converts from heathenism, suitable to the special wants of various countries; and they recommend as follows:—

3.—They think it very important that such books should not be introduced or multiplied without proper authority; and, since grave inconvenience might follow the use of different Prayer Books in the same district, in English and American Missions, they recommend that, whenever it is possible, one Prayer Book only should be in use.

4.—It is expedient that Books of Common Prayer, suitable to the needs of native congregations in heathen countries, should be framed; that the principles embodied in such books should be identical with the principles embodied in the Book of Common Prayer; and that the deviations from the Book of Common Prayer in point of form should only be such as are required by the circumstances of particular churches.

5.—In the case of heathen countries not under English or

American rule, any such book should be approved by a Board consisting of the Bishop or Bishops under whose authority the book is intended to be used, and of certain clergymen, not less than three where possible, from the Diocese or Dioceses, or district, and should then be communicated by such Bishop or Bishops, or by the Metropolitan of the Province to which any such Bishop belongs, to a Board in England, consisting of the Archbishops of England and Ireland, the Bishop of London, the Primus of the Scottish Episcopal Church, together with two Bishops and four clergymen selected by them, and also to a Board appointed by the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.

6.—No such book should be held to have been authorised for use in public worship, unless it have received the sanction of these two Boards.

7.—In any Diocese of a country under English rule, all such new books, being modifications or versions of the Book of Common Prayer, should be submitted, after approval by local authority, to the Board in England only.

II.

8.—Your Committee have considered the case of Missions in countries not under English or American rule, and they recommend as follows:—

9.—In cases where two Bishops of the Anglican Communion are ministering in the same country, as in China, Japan, and Western Africa at the present time, your Committee are of opinion that under existing circumstances each Bishop should have control of his own clergy, and their converts and congregations.

10.—The various Bishops in the same country should endeavour, as members of the same Communion, to keep up brotherly intercourse with each other on the subject of their Missionary work.

11.—In countries not under English or American rule, the English or American Church would not ordinarily undertake to establish Dioceses with strictly-defined territorial limits; although either Church might indicate the district in which it was intended that the Missionary Bishop should labour.

12.—Bishops in the same country should take care not to interfere in any manner with the congregations or converts of each other.

13.—It is most undesirable that either Church should for the future send a Bishop or Missionaries to a town or district already occupied by a Bishop of another branch of the Anglican Communion.

14.—When it is intended to send forth any new Missionary Bishop, notification of such an intention should be sent beforehand to the Archbishop of Canterbury, to the Presiding Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, and to the Metropolitan of any Province near which the Missionary Bishop is to minister.

III.

15.—Your Committee have had before them a communication from the Bishop of Calcutta,[1] dated June 4th, 1878, containing Resolutions of the Bishops of India and Ceylon, also a letter from Bishop Caldwell, dated June 1st, 1878, on the subject of the relation of Bishops abroad to the Missionaries in their Dioceses or districts.

16.—The questions raised by the Bishop of Calcutta's communication relate to the power and authority of the Bishop in respect of giving and withdrawing the licenses, 1st, of the clergy under his charge; 2nd, of lay readers and catechists; also to the rights of the Bishop in reference to changes in the management, order of service, and place of worship of any congregation.

17.—As regards the licensing of the clergy, it is admitted generally that every Missionary clergyman, whether appointed by a society or otherwise, should receive the license of the Bishop in whose Diocese he is to labour; but your Committee are of opinion that, in case of refusal to give a license to a clergyman, the Bishop should, if the clergyman desire it, state the reasons of his refusal, and transmit them to the Metropolitan, who should have power to decide upon their sufficiency; such reasons should also be accessible to the person whose license is in question. Where there is no Metropolitan, the reasons should be transmitted to the Archbishop of Canterbury, who should decide in like manner.

18.—As regards the withdrawal of a license, your Committee find that in some Provinces the mode of proceeding for revocation has been fixed by canon, and the jurisdiction thus created has been established by consent. For these places it is not necessary to make any recommendations. Where no such jurisdiction exists, your Committee recommend that the Bishop should in no case proceed to the revocation of a clergyman's license without affording him the opportunity of showing cause against it, and that if the Bishop shall afterwards proceed to revoke the license, he should, if the clergyman desire it, state the reasons for his decision to such clergyman, and also to the Metropolitan, who should have power to sanction or disallow the revocation. In cases where there is no Metropolitan, the Archbishop of Canterbury should be regarded as the Metropolitan for this purpose. No such revocation should take place, except for grave ecclesiastical offences.

[1] Right Rev. E. R. Johnson.

19.—The Bishop would probably find it desirable, where the clergyman is connected with one of the great Missionary societies, to communicate with the society or its local representatives before taking steps for revocation of a license.

20.—With regard to lay agents, your Committee consider it desirable that such as are employed in more important spiritual functions should have the license or other express sanction of the Bishop; and that other laymen employed in Missionary work should be considered to have the implied sanction of the Bishop, and should not continue to be so employed, if the Bishop see fit, for a grave reason, to forbid them.

21.—The authority of the Bishop in appointing places for public worship has been always admitted in the Church. Every place in which the Holy Communion is regularly celebrated should have the sanction of the Bishop.

22.—Your Committee have been asked for an opinion as to Subordinate, Co-ordinate, or Suffragan Bishops in India, to minister to native congregations, within the limits of another Diocese. Your Committee think that there are manifest objections to the appointment of a Bishop to minister to certain congregations within the Diocese of another Bishop, and wholly independent of him. Your Committee think that, for the present, the appointment of Assistant Bishops, whether European or native, subordinate to the Bishop of the Diocese, would meet the special needs of India in this matter, and would offer the best security for order and peace.

4. *Report of Committee on the position of Anglican Chaplains and Chaplaincies on the Continent of Europe and elsewhere.*

1.—Your Committee have to report that they have agreed to the following recommendations:—

2.—I. That it is highly desirable that Anglican congregations, on the Continent of Europe and elsewhere, should be distinctly urged not to admit the stated ministrations of any Clergyman without the written license or permission of the Bishop of the Anglican Communion who is duly authorised to grant it; and that the occasional assistance of strangers should not be invited or permitted without some satisfactory evidence of their ordination and character as clergymen.

3.—II. That it is desirable, as a general rule, that two chapels shall not be established where one is sufficient for the members of both Churches, American and English; also that where there is only one church or chapel the members of both Churches should be represented on the Committee, if any.

4.—III. That it be suggested to the Societies which partly support Continental Chaplaincies, that, in places where English and American churchmen reside or visit, and especially where Americans outnumber the English, it may be desirable to appoint a properly-accredited clergyman of the American Church.

5.—IV. That your Committee, having carefully considered a Memorial addressed to the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church of England by four Priests and certain other members of "the Spanish and Portuguese Reformed Episcopal Church," praying for the consecration of a Bishop, cannot but express their hearty sympathy with the Memorialists in the difficulties of their position; and, having heard a statement on the subject of the proposed extension of the Episcopate to Mexico by the American Church, they venture to suggest that, when a Bishop shall have been consecrated by the American Church for Mexico, he might be induced to visit Spain and Portugal, and render such assistance, at this stage of the movement, as may seem to him practicable and advisable.

5. *Report of Committee appointed to receive questions submitted to them, in writing, by Bishops desiring the advice of the Conference on difficulties or problems they have met with in their several Dioceses, and to report thereon.*

Attention has been called to the following subjects by questions submitted to your Committee:—

A.

(1.) The position which the Anglican Church should assume towards the "Old Catholics" and towards other persons on the Continent of Europe who have renounced their allegiance to the Church of Rome, and who are desirous of forming some connection with the Anglican Church, either English or American.

(2.) Applications for intercommunion between themselves and the Anglican Church from persons connected with the Armenian and other Christian communities in the East.

(3.) The position of Moravian ministers within the territorial limits of Dioceses of the Anglican Communion.

B.

(1.) The West Indian Dioceses.
  (*a*) Their proposed Provincial organisation.
  (*b*) The position of their Diaconate.
(2.) The Church of Haiti.

C.

Local peculiarities regarding the Laws of Marriage.

D.

A Board of Reference for matters connected with Foreign Missions.

E.

Difficulties arising in the Church of England from the revival of obsolete forms of Ritual, and from erroneous teaching on the subject of Confession.

A.

The fact that a solemn protest is raised in so many Churches and Christian communities throughout the world against the usurpations of the See of Rome, and against the novel doctrines promulgated by its authority, is a subject for thankfulness to Almighty God. All sympathy is due from the Anglican Church to the Churches and individuals protesting against these errors, and labouring, it may be, under special difficulties from the assaults of unbelief as well as from the pretensions of Rome.

We acknowledge but one Mediator between God and men—the Man Christ Jesus, Who is over all, God blessed for ever. We reject, as contrary to the Scriptures and to Catholic truth, any doctrine which would set up other mediators in His place, or which would take away from the Divine Majesty of the fulness of the Godhead which dwelleth in Him, and which gave an infinite value to the spotless Sacrifice which He offered, once for all, on the Cross for the sins of the whole world.

It is therefore our duty to warn the faithful that the act done by the Bishop of Rome, in the Vatican Council, in the year 1870—whereby he asserted a supremacy over all men in matters both of faith and morals, on the ground of an assumed infallibility—was an invasion of the attributes of the Lord Jesus Christ.

The principles on which the Church of England has reformed itself are well known. We proclaim the sufficiency and supremacy of the Holy Scriptures as the ultimate rule of faith, and commend to our people the diligent study of the same. We confess our faith in the words of the ancient Catholic creeds. We retain the Apostolic order of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. We assert the just liberties of particular or national Churches. We provide our people, in their own tongue, with a Book of Common Prayer and Offices for the administration of the Sacraments, in accordance with the best and most ancient types of Christian faith and worship. These documents are before the world, and can be

known and read of all men. We gladly welcome every effort for reform upon the model of the Primitive Church. We do not demand a rigid uniformity; we deprecate needless divisions; but to those who are drawn to us in the endeavour to free themselves from the yoke of error and superstition we are ready to offer all help, and such privileges as may be acceptable to them and are consistent with the maintenance of our own principles as enunciated in our formularies.

Your Committee recommend that questions of the class now submitted to them be dealt with in this spirit. For the consideration, however, of any definite cases in which advice and assistance may, from time to time, be sought, your Committee recommend that the Archbishops of England and Ireland, with the Bishop of London, the Primus of the Scottish Episcopal Church, and the Presiding Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, the Bishop superintending the congregations of the same upon the Continent of Europe, and the Bishop of Gibraltar, together with such other Bishops as they may associate with themselves, be requested to advise upon such cases as circumstances may require.

With regard to the special questions now raised respecting Moravian Orders,[1] the above-mentioned prelates are recommended to associate with themselves such learned persons as they may deem eminently qualified to assist them by their knowledge of the historical difficulties involved.

B.

1. (*a*) With respect to the West Indian Dioceses, assuming such Dioceses to desire to be combined into a Province, your Committee advise that the formal consent of the Diocesan Representative Synods, if free (as regards their relation to the State) to give such consent, be first obtained.

The Bishops of the several Dioceses would then forward such

[1] The special questions submitted were the following:—

"1. If a Moravian presbyter or deacon desires to be received into the Anglican Ministry, ought I to (*a*) ordain him absolutely; (*b*) reordain him conditionally; (*c*) accept his orders as valid, and simply give him mission in the Anglican Church?"

"2. Can I canonically and regularly commission a Bishop of the Unitas Fratrum in my Diocese either to confirm or to ordain for me, or to do both Episcopal acts according to the Anglican ritual?"

"3. Am I justified, if called on, to confirm children, or ordain presbyters or deacons, or do both for the Moravians, in their churches, and according to their ritual?"

"4. May Anglican presbyters and deacons, with their Bishop's sanction, officiate and minister the sacraments in Moravian churches, according to their ritual, and invite Moravian presbyters or deacons to execute the functions appertaining to their office in Anglican churches, and according to Anglican ritual?"

formal consent, or expressed desire, to the Archbishop of Canterbury, requesting him to give his sanction to the formation of the Province.

Whether the General Synod of the Province should consist of the Bishops, with representatives of the clergy and laity of the respective Dioceses, or should consist of the Bishops of the Province only; and, in the latter case, what limitation should be imposed on the powers of such purely Episcopal Synod, is a question which ought to be left to the Diocesan Synods to decide, with the approval of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

If the West Indian Dioceses be formed into a Province, it seems desirable that a Metropolitan should be, in the first instance, elected from and by the Bishops of the West Indian Dioceses.

(*b*) The questions [1] submitted respecting the peculiar circumstances of the West Indian Diaconate appear to your Committee, upon full consideration, to be such as can be adequately decided only in Diocesan or Provincial Synods.

2. Your Committee desire to express their satisfaction on learning that a Church in connection with the Anglican Communion has been planted in the island of Haiti; that a Bishop has been consecrated thereto by Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, and the Bishop of Kingston, Jamaica; and that successful efforts are being made for the training of a native Ministry; and your Committee trust that God's blessing may rest upon the Bishop, Priests, and Deacons, and all other members of this Church.

C.

With regard to those questions in connection with the Laws of Marriage which have been submitted to them, your Committee, while fully recognising the difficulties in which various branches of the Church have been placed by the action of local Legislatures, are of opinion that steps should be taken by each branch of the Church, according to its own discretion, to maintain the sanctity of marriage, agreeably to the principles set forth in the Word of God, as the Church of Christ hath hitherto received the same.

[1] These questions raised the following points:—

1. The desirableness, or otherwise, of recognising a Diaconate which, in certain cases, shall be practically permanent, instead of regarding the Diaconate as the invariable step to the Presbyterate.

2. The desirableness, or otherwise, of permitting Deacons to engage in such secular callings as are not inconsistent with the due and edifying discharge of sacred functions.

3. What modifications, if any, should be allowed as regards the intellectual qualifications and tests to be required of, and imposed on, such laymen as desire to become Deacons without relinquishing their secular vocation.

D.

With respect to what has been submitted to us on the subject of Foreign Missions, your Committee are of opinion that it is desirable to appoint a Board of Reference, to advise upon questions brought before it either by Diocesan or Missionary Bishops or by Missionary Societies. Your Committee are further of opinion that the details of the formation and constitution of such Board ought to be referred to the Archbishops of England and Ireland, the Bishop of London, the Primus of the Scottish Episcopal Church, the Presiding Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, with the Bishop superintending the congregations of the same upon the Continent of Europe, and such other Bishops as they may associate with themselves, who should communicate with the authorities of the various Colonial Churches, and with the existing Missionary Organisations of the Anglican Communion.

E.

Considering unhappy disputes on questions of ritual, whereby divers congregations in the Church of England and elsewhere have been seriously disquieted, your Committee desire to affirm the principle that no alteration from long-accustomed ritual should be made contrary to the admonition of the Bishop of the Diocese.

Further, having in view certain novel practices and teachings on the subject of Confession, your Committee desire to affirm that in the matter of Confession the Churches of the Anglican Communion hold fast those principles which are set forth in the Holy Scriptures, which were professed by the Primitive Church, and which were reaffirmed at the English Reformation; and it is their deliberate opinion that no minister of the Church is authorised to require from those who may resort to him to open their grief a particular or detailed enumeration of all their sins, or to require private confession previous to receiving the Holy Communion, or to enjoin or even encourage the practice of habitual confession to a Priest, or to teach that such practice of habitual confession, or the being subject to what has been termed the direction of a Priest, is a condition of attaining to the highest spiritual life. At the same time your Committee are not to be understood as desiring to limit in any way the provision made in the Book of Common Prayer for the relief of troubled consciences.

These are the Reports of the Conference, and the practical conclusions at which we have arrived. Some of these conclusions have reference to the special circumstances of different branches of the One Church of Christ, according

to peculiarities of their various Missionary work for the heathen, or their labours amongst their own people; some embody principles which apply to all branches of the Church Universal. They are all limited in their scope to those subjects which have been distinctly brought before the assembled Bishops. We invite to them the attention of the various Synods and other governing powers in the several Churches, and of all the faithful in Christ Jesus throughout the world.

We do not claim to be lords over God's heritage, but we commend the results of this our Conference to the reason and conscience of our brethren as enlightened by the Holy Spirit of God, praying that all throughout the world who call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ may be of one mind, may be united in one fellowship, may hold fast the Faith once delivered to the saints, and worship their one Lord in the spirit of purity and love.

Signed, on behalf of the Conference,

A. C. CANTUAR.

C. J. GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL,
Secretary of the Conference.

HENRY, BISHOP OF EDINBURGH,
Secretary of Committees.

I. BRUNEL, Chancellor of the Diocese of Ely,
Assistant Secretary.

NOTE A (page 83).

The Churches thus united are, at this time, the Church of England, and the Churches planted by her in India, the Colonies, and elsewhere, most of which Churches are associated into distinct Provinces [1]; the Church of Ireland; the Episcopal Church in

[1] There are six Provinces, viz. :—

India, with six Dioceses.
Canada, with nine Dioceses.
Rupertsland, with four Dioceses.
South Africa, with eight Dioceses.
Australia, with twelve Dioceses.
New Zealand, with seven Dioceses.

And there are twenty Dioceses not yet associated in Provinces.

Scotland; the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, with its Missionary Branches; and the Church in Haiti. Among the external evidences of the unity of these Churches, none is more significant than that which frequently occurs—the uniting of Bishops of different Churches, *e.g.*, of English, Scottish, and American Bishops, in that most important function, by which the Episcopal succession is continued. On more than one occasion, also, the Church in Scotland has consecrated a Bishop in behalf of the Church of England, when legal difficulties have impeded the consecration in England.

NOTE B (page 83).

One of the results of the first Lambeth Conference was the appointment of a Committee to prepare a Bill for placing on a more satisfactory footing the status in England of clergy ordained by Bishops of Colonial and other Churches, outside the Church in England.

A Bill to effect this object was introduced by Lord Blachford into Parliament in the Session of 1873, and became law in the Session of 1874, under the name of "The Colonial Clergy Act, 1874." (37 & 38 Vict., cap. 77.)

The Act does not apply to the clergy of the Episcopal Church in Scotland. The legal disabilities of the Scottish clergy were removed, and their position defined, by the Act, 27 & 28 Vict., cap. 94.

With this exception, the Act of 1874 deals with the status of all clergy ordained by Bishops other than Bishops of Dioceses in England and Ireland. It proceeds upon the assumption that all clergymen so ordained may be admitted to exercise their functions in the Church of England; but that the Bishops of that Church have a right, in respect of these clergy, to discretionary powers, analogous to those which they have in the case of ordination.

The following are the provisions of the Act which affect the clergy ordained by Bishops other than those of (1) Dioceses in England; or (2) The Church of Ireland; or (3) The Episcopal Church in Scotland.

"Section 3.—Except as hereinafter mentioned, no person who has been or shall be ordained Priest or Deacon, as the case may be, by any Bishop other than a Bishop of a Diocese in one of the Churches aforesaid shall, unless he shall hold or have previously held preferment or a curacy in England, officiate as such Priest or Deacon in any church or chapel in England, without written permission from the Archbishop of the Province in which he proposes to officiate, and without also making and subscribing so much of

the declaration contained in 'The Clerical Subscription Act, 1865,' as follows:—that is to say,

"'I assent to the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, and to the Book of Common Prayer, and of the Ordering of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. I believe the doctrine of the Church of England as therein set forth to be agreeable to the Word of God; and in public prayer and administration of the sacraments, I, whilst ministering in England, will use the form in the said Book prescribed and none other, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority.'

"Section 4.—Except as hereinafter mentioned, no person who has been or shall be ordained Priest or Deacon, as the case may be, by any Bishop other than a Bishop of a Diocese in one of the Churches aforesaid, shall be entitled as such Priest or Deacon to be admitted or instituted to any benefice or other ecclesiastical preferment in England, or to act as Curate therein, without the previous consent in writing of the Bishop of the Diocese in which such preferment or curacy may be situate.

"Section 5.—Any person holding ecclesiastical preferment, or acting as Curate in any Diocese in England under the provisions of this Act, may, with the written consent of the Bishop of such Diocese, request the Archbishop of the Province to give him a license in writing under his hand and seal in the following form: that is to say:—

"'To the Rev. *A.B.*,

"'We, *C.*, by Divine Providence Archbishop of *D.*, do hereby give you, the said *A.B.*, authority to exercise your office of Priest (*or* Deacon) according to the provisions of an Act of the thirty-seventh and thirty-eighth years of her present Majesty, intituled "An Act respecting Colonial and certain other Clergy."

"'Given under our hand and seal on the day of .

"'*C.* (L.S.) *D.*'

"And if the Archbishop shall think fit to issue such license, the same shall be registered in the registry of the Province, and the person receiving the license shall thenceforth possess all such rights and advantages, and be subject to all such duties and liabilities, as he would have possessed and been subject to if he had been ordained by the Bishop of a Diocese in England: Provided that no such license shall be issued to any person who has not held ecclesiastical preferment or acted as Curate for a period or periods exceeding in the aggregate two years."

The Act also contains the following provision as to the Consecration of Bishops:—

"Section 12.—It shall be lawful for the Archbishop of Canter-

bury or the Archbishop of York, for the time being, in consecrating any person to the office of a Bishop, for the purpose of exercising Episcopal functions elsewhere than in England, to dispense, if he think fit, with the oath of due obedience to the Archbishop."

Note C (page 84).

The following extract from the Report refers to this subject:—

"Your Committee strongly recommend that all those Dioceses which are not as yet gathered into Provinces should, as soon as possible, form part of some Provincial organisation. The particular mode of effecting this in each case must be determined by those who are concerned."

The Committee would also call attention to the concluding paragraph of the same Report:—

"In the case of the limits of an existing Province being altered, the consent of the Synod of that Province would be required for the alteration."

VII.

1888

LIST OF THE BISHOPS ATTENDING THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE OF 1888, ARRANGED ACCORDING TO PROVINCES. (See p. 38.)

Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Rev. Dr. Benson).
Bishop of London (Rt. Rev. Dr. Temple).
Bishop of Winchester (Rt. Rev. Dr. Harold Browne).
Bishop of Norwich (Rt. Rev. and Hon. Dr. Pelham).
Bishop of Bangor (Rt. Rev. Dr. Campbell).
Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol (Rt. Rev. Dr. Ellicott).
Bishop of St. Alban's (Rt. Rev. Dr. Claughton).
Bishop of Hereford (Rt. Rev. Dr. Atlay).
Bishop of Peterborough (Rt. Rev. Dr. Magee).
Bishop of Bath and Wells (Rt. Rev. Lord A. Hervey).
Bishop of Chichester (Rt. Rev. Dr. Durnford).
Bishop of St. Asaph (Rt. Rev. Dr. Hughes).
Bishop of St. David's (Rt. Rev. Dr. Basil Jones).
Bishop of Rochester (Rt. Rev. Dr. Thorold).
Bishop of Lichfield (Rt. Rev. Dr. Maclagan).
Bishop of Llandaff (Rt. Rev. Dr. Lewis).
Bishop of Truro (Rt. Rev. Dr. Wilkinson).
Bishop of Southwell (Rt. Rev. Dr. Ridding).
Bishop of Lincoln (Rt. Rev. Dr. King).
Bishop of Exeter (Rt. Rev. Dr. E. H. Bickersteth).
Bishop of Salisbury (Rt. Rev. Dr. J. Wordsworth).
Bishop of Ely (Rt. Rev. Lord A. Compton).
Bishop Suffragan of Dover (Rt. Rev. Dr. Parry).
Bishop Suffragan of Nottingham (Rt. Rev. Dr. Trollope).
Bishop Suffragan of Colchester (Rt. Rev. Dr. Blomfield).
Bishop Suffragan of Marlborough (Rt. Rev. Dr. Earle).
Bishop Suffragan of Shrewsbury (Rt. Rev. Sir L. Stamer).

Bishop Suffragan of Bedford (Rt. Rev. Dr. Billing).
Bishop Suffragan of Leicester (Rt. Rev. Dr. Thicknesse).
Bishop Perry.
Bishop Tufnell.
Bishop Bromby.
Bishop Wilkinson.
Bishop Mitchinson.

Archbishop of York (Most Rev. Dr. Thomson).
Bishop of Durham (Rt. Rev. Dr. Lightfoot).
Bishop of Carlisle (Rt. Rev. Dr. Goodwin).
Bishop of Manchester (Rt. Rev. Dr. Moorhouse).
Bishop of Wakefield (Rt. Rev. Dr. Walsham How).
Bishop of Liverpool (Rt. Rev. Dr. Ryle).
Bishop of Newcastle (Rt. Rev. Dr. Wilberforce).
Bishop of Chester (Rt. Rev. Dr. Stubbs).
Bishop of Ripon (Rt. Rev. Dr. Boyd Carpenter).
Bishop of Sodor and Man (Rt. Rev. Dr. Bardsley).
Bishop Suffragan of Penrith (Rt. Rev. Dr. Pulleine).
Bishop Cramer-Roberts.

Archbishop of Armagh (Most Rev. Dr. Knox).
Bishop of Meath (Most Rev. Dr. Reichel).
Bishop of Derry (Rt. Rev. Dr. Alexander).
Bishop of Kilmore (Rt. Rev. Dr. Shone).
Bishop of Clogher (Rt. Rev. Dr. Stack).

Archbishop of Dublin (Most Rev. Lord Plunket).
Bishop of Limerick (Rt. Rev. Dr. Graves).
Bishop of Cashel (Rt. Rev. Dr. Day).
Bishop of Cork (Rt. Rev. Dr. Gregg).
Bishop of Ossory (Rt. Rev. Dr. Walsh).
Bishop of Killaloe (Rt. Rev. Dr. Chester).

Bishop of Brechin (Rt. Rev. Dr. Jermyn), *Primus*.
Bishop of St. Andrew's (Rt. Rev. Dr. C. Wordsworth).
Bishop of Moray and Ross (Rt. Rev. Dr. Kelly).
Bishop of Aberdeen (Rt. Rev. and Hon. Dr. Douglas).
Bishop of Argyll and the Isles (Rt. Rev. Dr. Haldane).
Bishop of Edinburgh (Rt. Rev. Dr. Dowden).

Bishop of Minnesota (Rt. Rev. Dr. Whipple).
Bishop of Western New York (Rt. Rev. Dr. Coxe).
Bishop of Tennessee (Rt. Rev. Dr. Quintard).
Bishop of Maine (Rt. Rev. Dr. Neely).
Bishop of Missouri (Rt. Rev. Dr. Tuttle).
Bishop of Oregon (Rt. Rev. Dr. Morris).

Bishop of Albany (Rt. Rev. Dr. Doane).
Bishop of Pennsylvania (Rt. Rev. Dr. Whitaker).
Bishop of Arkansas (Rt. Rev. Dr. Pierce).
Bishop of South Dakota (Rt. Rev. Dr. Hare).
Bishop of Massachusetts (Rt. Rev. Dr. Paddock).
Bishop of North Carolina (Rt. Rev. Dr. Lyman).
Bishop of Colorado (Rt. Rev. Dr. Spalding).
Bishop of Milwaukee (Rt. Rev. Dr. Welles).
Bishop of New Jersey (Rt. Rev. Dr. Scarborough).
Bishop of Chicago (Rt. Rev. Dr. McLaren).
Bishop of Iowa (Rt. Rev. Dr. Stevens-Parry).
Bishop of Quincy (Rt. Rev. Dr. Burgess).
Bishop of Springfield (Rt. Rev. Dr. Seymour).
Bishop of Michigan (Rt. Rev. Dr. Harris).
Bishop of Newark (Rt. Rev. Dr. Starkey).
Bishop of Washington Territory (Rt. Rev. Dr. Paddock).
Bishop of Pittsburgh (Rt. Rev. Dr. Whitehead).
Bishop of Mississippi (Rt. Rev. Dr. Thompson).
Bishop of Indiana (Rt. Rev. Dr. Knickerbacker).
Bishop of New York (Rt. Rev. Dr. Potter).
Bishop of North Dakota (Rt. Rev. Dr. Walker).
Asst.-Bishop of Central Pennsylvania (Rt. Rev. Dr. Rulison).
Bishop of Maryland (Rt. Rev. Dr. Paret).

Bishop of Fredericton (Rt. Rev. Dr. Medley), *Metropolitan*.
Bishop of Ontario (Rt. Rev. Dr. Lewis).
Bishop of Quebec (Rt. Rev. Dr. Williams).
Bishop of Toronto (Rt. Rev. Dr. Sweatman).
Bishop of Algoma (Rt. Rev. Dr. Sullivan).
Bishop of Huron (Rt. Rev. Dr. Baldwin).
Bishop of Niagara (Rt. Rev. Dr. Hamilton).
Bishop of Nova Scotia (Rt. Rev. Dr. Courtney).
Bishop Coadjutor of Fredericton (Rt. Rev. Dr. Kingdon).

Bishop of Calcutta (Rt. Rev. Dr. Johnson), *Metropolitan*.
Bishop of Colombo (Rt. Rev. Dr. Copleston).
Bishop of Bombay (Rt. Rev. Dr. Mylne).
Bishop of Travancore and Cochin (Rt. Rev. Dr. Speechley).
Bishop of Rangoon (Rt. Rev. Dr. Strachan).

Bishop of Guiana (Rt. Rev. Dr. Austin), *Metropolitan*.
Bishop of Antigua (Rt. Rev. Dr. Jackson).
Bishop of Trinidad (Rt. Rev. Dr. Rawle).
Bishop of Jamaica (Rt. Rev. Dr. Nuttall).
Bishop of Barbados (Rt. Rev. Dr. Bree).
Bishop of Nassau (Rt. Rev. Dr. Churton).
Bishop Coadjutor of Antigua (Rt. Rev. Dr. Branch).

Bishop of Sydney (Rt. Rev. Dr. Barry), *Metropolitan.*
Bishop of North Queensland (Rt. Rev. Dr. Stanton).
Bishop of Adelaide (Rt. Rev. Dr. Kennion).
Bishop of Brisbane (Rt. Rev. Dr. Webber).

Bishop of Nelson (Rt. Rev. Dr. Suter).
Bishop of Auckland (Rt. Rev. Dr. Cowie).
Bishop of Dunedin (Rt. Rev. Dr. Neville).
Bishop of Waiapu (Rt. Rev. Dr. Stuart).

Bishop of Capetown (Rt. Rev. Dr. W. W. Jones), *Metropolitan.*
Bishop of Maritzburg (Rt. Rev. Dr. Macrorie).
Bishop of Grahamstown (Rt. Rev. Dr. Webb).
Bishop of Pretoria (Rt. Rev. Dr. Bousfield).
Bishop of Zululand (Rt. Rev. Dr. Mackenzie).
Bishop of St. John's, Kaffraria (Rt. Rev. Dr. Key).

Bishop of Rupertsland (Rt. Rev. Dr. Machray), *Metropolitan.*
Bishop of Moosonee (Rt. Rev. Dr. Horden).
Bishop of Qu'Appelle (Rt. Rev. and Hon. Dr. Anson).
Bishop of Saskatchewan & Calgary (Rt. Rev. Dr. Pinkham).

Bishop of Columbia (Rt. Rev. Dr. Hills).
Missionary Bishop in the Niger Territory (Rt. Rev. Dr. Crowther).
Bishop of the Falkland Islands (Rt. Rev. Dr. Stirling).
Bishop of Honolulu (Rt. Rev. Dr. Willis).
Bishop of Gibraltar (Rt. Rev. Dr. Sandford).
Bishop of Newfoundland (Rt. Rev. Dr. Llewellyn Jones).
Bishop of Caledonia (Rt. Rev. Dr. Ridley).
Bishop of New Westminster (Rt. Rev. Dr. Sillitoe).
Missionary Bishop in North China (Rt. Rev. Dr. Scott).
Bishop of Singapore and Sarawak (Rt. Rev. Dr. Hose).
Bishop of Sierra Leone (Rt. Rev. Dr. Ingham).
Missionary Bishop in Central Africa (Rt. Rev. Dr. Smythies).
Missionary Bishop in Japan (Rt. Rev. Dr. E. Bickersteth).
Bishop of the Church of England in Jerusalem and the East (Rt. Rev. Dr. Blyth).

Officers of the Conference.

Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol (Rt. Rev. Dr. Ellicott), *Episcopal Secretary.*
Dean of Windsor (Very Rev. R. T. Davidson), *General Secretary.*
Archdeacon of Maidstone (Ven. B. F. Smith), *Assistant Secretary.*

VIII.

Encyclical Letter issued by the Bishops attending the third Lambeth Conference, July, 1888. (See p. 37.)

To the Faithful in Christ Jesus, greeting—

We, Archbishops, Bishops Metropolitan, and other Bishops of the Holy Catholic Church, in full communion with the Church of England, one hundred and forty-five in number, all having superintendence over Dioceses or lawfully commissioned to exercise Episcopal functions therein, assembled from divers parts of the earth, at Lambeth Palace, in the year of our Lord 1888, under the presidency of the Most Reverend Edward, by Divine Providence Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England and Metropolitan, after receiving in the Chapel of the said Palace the Blessed Sacrament of the Lord's Body and Blood, and uniting in prayer for the guidance of the Holy Spirit, have taken into consideration various questions which have been submitted to us affecting the welfare of God's people and the condition of the Church in divers parts of the world.

We have made these matters the subject of careful and serious deliberation during the month past, both in general Conference and in Committees specially appointed to consider the several questions; and we now commend to the faithful the conclusions at which we have arrived.

We have appended to this letter two sets of documents, the one containing the formal Resolutions [1] of the Conference, and the other the Reports of the several Committees.[2] We desire you to bear in mind that the Conference is

[1] See p. 119. [2] See p. 125.

responsible for the first alone. The Reports of Committees can only be taken to represent the mind of the Conference in so far as they are reaffirmed or directly adopted in the Resolutions; but we have thought good to print these Reports, believing that they will offer fruitful matter for consideration.

In the first place we desire to speak of the moral and practical questions which have engaged the attention of the Conference; and in the forefront we would place the duty of the Church in the promotion of temperance and purity.

Temperance.

Noble and self-denying efforts have been made for many years, within and without the Church, for the suppression of intemperance, and it is our earnest hope that these efforts will be increased manifold. The evil effects of this sin on the life of the Church and the nation can scarcely be exaggerated. But we are constrained to utter a caution against a false principle which threatens to creep in and vitiate much useful work. Highly valuable as we believe total abstinence to be as a means to an end, we desire to discountenance the language which condemns the use of wine as wrong in itself, independently of its effects on ourselves or on others, and we have expressed our disapproval of a reported practice (which seems to be due to some extent to the tacit assumption of this principle) of substituting some other liquid in the celebration of Holy Communion.

Purity.

On the other hand, Christian society is only now awakening to a sense of its active duty in the matter of purity; and we therefore desire to avail ourselves of an occasion which has brought together representatives of the Anglican Communion from distant parts of the world, to proclaim a crusade against that sin which is before all others a

defilement of the body of Christ and a desecration of the temple of the Holy Spirit. We recall the earnest language of the Report: we believe that nothing short of general action by all Christian people will avail to arrest the evil; we call upon you to rally round the standard of a high and pure morality; and we appeal to all whom our voice may reach to assist us in raising the tone of public opinion, and in stamping out ignoble and corrupt traditions which are not only a dishonour to the Name of our Master Christ, but degrading to the dignity of a being created in the image of God.

Sanctity of Marriage.

In vital connection with the promotion of purity is the maintenance of the sanctity of marriage, which is the centre of social morality. This is seriously compromised by facilities of Divorce which have been increased in recent years by legislation in some countries. We have therefore held it our duty to reaffirm emphatically the precept of Christ relating thereto, and to offer some advice which may guide the Clergy of our Communion in their attitude towards any infringement of the Master's rule.

Polygamy.

The sanctity of marriage as a Christian obligation implies the faithful union of one man with one woman until the union is severed by death. The polygamous alliances of heathen races are allowed on all hands to be condemned by the law of Christ; but they present many difficult practical problems which have been solved in various ways in the past. We have carefully considered this question in the different lights thrown upon it from various parts of the mission-field. While we have refrained from offering advice on minor points, leaving these to be settled by the local authorities of the Church, we have laid down some broad lines on which alone we consider that the missionary may safely act. Our first care has been to maintain and

protect the Christian conception of marriage, believing that any immediate and rapid successes which might otherwise have been secured in the mission-field would be dearly purchased by any lowering or confusion of this idea.

Observance of the Lord's Day.

The due observance of Sunday as a day of rest, of worship, and of religious teaching, has a direct bearing on the moral well-being of the Christian community. We have observed of late a growing laxity which threatens to impair its sacred character. We strongly deprecate this tendency. We call upon the leisurely classes not selfishly to withdraw from others the opportunities of rest and of religion. We call upon master and employer jealously to guard the privileges of the servant and the workman. In "the Lord's Day" we have a priceless heritage. Whoever misuses it incurs a terrible responsibility.

Socialism.

Intimately connected with these moral questions is the attitude of the Christian Church towards the social problems of the day. Excessive inequality in the distribution of this world's goods; vast accumulation and desperate poverty side by side: these suggest many anxious considerations to any thoughtful person, who is penetrated with the mind of Christ. No more important problems can well occupy the attention—whether of Clergy or Laity—than such as are connected with what is popularly called Socialism. To study schemes proposed for redressing the social balance, to welcome the good which may be found in the aims or operations of any, and to devise methods, whether by legislation or by social combinations, or in any other way, for a peaceful solution of the problems without violence or injustice, is one of the noblest pursuits which can engage the thoughts of those who strive to follow in the footsteps of Christ. Suggestions are offered in the Report, which may assist in solving the problem.[1]

[1] See p. 136.

Care of Emigrants.

One class of persons more especially had a claim upon the consideration and sympathy of the Conference. In our emigrants we have a social link which binds the Churches of the British Islands to the Church of the United States, and to the Churches in the Colonies. No more pertinent question, therefore, could have been suggested for our deliberations than our duty towards this large body of our fellow-Christians. It is especially incumbent upon the Church to follow them with the eye of sympathy at every point in their passage from their old home to their new, to exercise a watchful care over them, and to protect them from the dangers, moral and spiritual, which beset their path. We have endeavoured to offer some suggestions, by following which this end may be attained.[1]

Definite Teaching of the Faith.

Recognising thus the primary importance of maintaining the moral precepts and discipline of the Gospel in all the relations of life and society, we proceed to the consideration of the means, within the reach and contemplation of the Churches, for inculcating the definite truths of the Faith, which are the basis of such moral teaching.

We cannot escape the conviction that this department of work requires great attention and much improvement. The religious teaching of the young is sadly deficient in depth and reality, especially in the matter of doctrine. This deficiency is not confined to any class of society, and the task of remedying the default is one which the Laity must be prepared to share with the Clergy. On parents it lies as a divine charge. Godfathers and Godmothers should be urged to fulfil the duty which they have undertaken for the children whose sponsors they have been, and to see that they are not left uninstructed, or inadequately prepared for Confirmation. The use of public catechising and regular preparation of candidates for Confirmation is

[1] See p. 141.

capable of much development. The work done in Sunday Schools requires, as we believe, more constant supervision and more sustained interest than, in a great many cases, it receives from the Clergy. The instruction of Sunday-School teachers, and of the pupil-teachers in Elementary Schools, ought to be regarded as an indispensable part of the pastoral work of a Parish Priest; and the moral and practical lessons from the Bible ought to be enforced by constant reference to the sanctions, and to the illustrations of doctrine and discipline belonging to them, to be found in the same Holy Scripture. It would be possible, to a greater extent than is now done, to make sermons in church combine doctrinal and moral efficiency, and, by illustrating the rationale of divine service, lead on the congregations to the perception of the definite relations between worship, faith, and work—the lessons of the Prayer Book, the Catechism, and the Creeds.

It is not, however, with reference to the young alone, or to the recognised members of their own flock, that the Clergy have need to look carefully to the security of definiteness in teaching the faith.

The study of Holy Scripture is a great part of the mental discipline of the Christian, and the Bible itself is the main instrument in all teaching of religion. Unhappily, in the present day, there is a widespread system of propagandism hostile to the reception of the Bible as a treasury of Divine knowledge, and throughout society, in all its ranks, misgivings, doubts, hostile criticisms, and sceptical estimates of doctrinal truths as based on Revelation, are very common.

The doubts which arise from the misapprehension of the due relations between science and Revelation may be, and ought to be, treated with respect and a sympathetic patience; and, where minds have been disquieted by scientific discovery or assertion, great care should be taken not to extinguish the elements of faith, but rather to direct the thinker to the realisation of the fact that such discoveries elucidate the action of laws which, rightly

conceived, tend to the higher appreciation of the glorious work of the Creator, upheld by the word of His power.

The dangers arising from the hostile or sceptical temper and attitude are increased by the difficulty of determining how far our teaching and the popular acceptance of it can be harmonised with a due consideration for the views on inspiration, and especially on the character of the discipline of the Old Testament dispensation, which, although they have never received definite sanction in the Church, have been long and widely prevalent.

We must recommend to the Clergy cautious and industrious treatment of these points of controversy, and most earnestly press upon them the importance of taking, as the central thought of their teaching, our Lord Jesus Christ, as the sacrifice for our sins, as the healer of our sinfulness, the source of all our spiritual life, and the revelation to our consciences of the law and motive of all moral virtue. To Him and to His work all the teachings of the Old Testament converge, and from Him all the teachings of the New Testament flow, in spirit, in force, and in form. The work of the Church is the application and extension of the blessings of the Incarnation, and her teaching the development of its doctrinal issues as contained in the Creeds of the Church.

Mutual Relations.

Our discussion on the mutual relations of Dioceses and branches of our Communion has brought out some points which we desire to commend to your consideration. It appears necessary to draw attention to the principles laid down in the Conference of 1878,[1] and to urge that within our Communion the duly-certified action of each Church or Province should be respected by the other Churches and their members; that no Bishop or Clergyman should exercise his functions within any regularly-constituted Diocese without the consent of the Bishop of that Diocese; and that no Bishop should authorise the action of any Clergy-

[1] See p. 84.

man coming from another Diocese without proper letters testimonial. The neglect of these rules has led to some grievous scandals. The Bishops, on their part, are prepared to do their best to guard against such mischiefs, by adding private advice to the formal document in use, but the Clergy must resolve to exercise greater caution in signing testimonials; and those who require them must check all tendency to over-sensitiveness, when they find themselves subjected to inquiries as to character and identification, which, however unnecessary they may deem them in their own case, are certainly indispensable for securing such measure of safety as we require.

This caution applies with especial force to the Clergy ordained for colonial work. We most heartily recognise the principle that those who have given the best years of their life to work abroad are entitled to great consideration when the time comes at which they want such rest or change of employment as may be found at home. But to lay down any general rules on this point is impossible.

One matter has been laid before us in a more formal way —the possibility of constituting a Council or Councils of Reference to advise upon, or even to decide, questions laid before them by the authorities of the Provinces of the Colonial Church. As to this, we would counsel patient consideration and consultation, of such character as may eventually supersede the necessity for creating an authority which might, whether as a Council of advice, or in a function more closely resembling that of a Court, place us in circumstances prejudicial alike to order and to liberty of action.

Home Reunion.

After anxious discussion we have resolved to content ourselves with laying down certain articles as a basis on which approach may be, by God's blessing, made towards Home Reunion. These articles, four in number, will be found in the appended Resolutions. (See p. 122.)

The attitude of the Anglican Communion towards the religious bodies now separated from it by unhappy divisions would appear to be this:—We hold ourselves in readiness to enter into brotherly conference with any of those who may desire intercommunion with us in a more or less perfect form. We lay down conditions on which such intercommunion is, in our opinion, and according to our conviction, possible. For, however we may long to embrace those now alienated from us, so that the ideal of the one flock under the one Shepherd may be realised, we must not be unfaithful stewards of the great deposit entrusted to us. We cannot desert our position either as to faith or discipline. That concord would, in our judgment, be neither true nor desirable which should be produced by such surrender.

But we gladly and thankfully recognise the real religious work which is carried on by Christian bodies not of our Communion. We cannot close our eyes to the visible blessing which has been vouchsafed to their labours for Christ's sake. Let us not be misunderstood on this point. We are not insensible to the strong ties, the rooted convictions, which attach them to their present position. These we respect, as we wish that on our side our own principles and feelings may be respected. Competent observers, indeed, assert that not in England only, but in all parts of the Christian world, there is a real yearning for unity—that men's hearts are moved more than heretofore towards Christian fellowship. The Conference has shown in its discussions as well as its resolutions that it is deeply penetrated with this feeling. May the Spirit of Love move on the troubled waters of religious differences.

Relation to the Scandinavian Church.

Among the nations with whom English-speaking peoples are brought directly in contact are the Scandinavian races, who form an important element of the population in many of our dioceses. The attitude, therefore, which the Angli-

can Communion should take towards the Scandinavian Churches could not be a matter of indifference to this Conference. We have recommended that fuller knowledge should be sought and friendly intercourse interchanged until such time as matters may be ripe for a closer alliance without any sacrifice of principles which we hold to be essential.[1]

To Old Catholics and Others.

Nor, again, is it possible for members of the Anglican Communion to withhold their sympathies from those Continental movements towards Reformation which, under the greatest difficulties, have proceeded mainly on the same lines as our own, retaining Episcopacy as an Apostolic ordinance. Though we believe that the time has not come for any direct alliance with any of these, and, though we deprecate any precipitancy of action which would transgress primitive and established principles of jurisdiction, we believe that advances may be made without sacrifice of these, and we entertain the hope that the time may come when a more formal alliance with some at least of these bodies will be possible.

To the Eastern Churches.

The Conference has expressed its earnest desire to confirm and to improve the friendly relations which now exist between the Churches of the East and the Anglican Communion. These Churches have well earned the sympathy of Christendom, for through long ages of persecution they have kept alive in many a dark place the light of the Gospel. If that light is here and there feeble or dim, there is all the more reason that we, as we have opportunity, should tend and cherish it; and we need not fear that our offices of brotherly charity, if offered in a right spirit, will not be accepted. We reflect with thankfulness that there exist no bars, such as are presented to communion with the Latins by the formulated sanction of the Infallibility of

[1] See p. 161.

the Church residing in the person of the supreme pontiff, by the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, and other dogmas imposed by the decrees of Papal Councils. The Church of Rome has always treated her Eastern sister wrongfully. She intrudes her Bishops into the ancient Dioceses, and keeps up a system of active proselytism. The Eastern Church is reasonably outraged by these proceedings, wholly contrary as they are to Catholic principles; and it behoves us of the Anglican Communion to take care that we do not offend in like manner.

Individuals craving fuller light and stronger spiritual life may, by remaining in the Church of their baptism, become centres of enlightenment to their own people.

But though all schemes of proselytising are to be avoided, it is only right that our real claims and position as a historical Church should be set before a people who are very distrustful of novelty, especially in religion, and who appreciate the history of Catholic antiquity. Help should be given towards the education of the Clergy, and, in more destitute communities, extended to schools for general instruction.

Authoritative Standards.

The authoritative standards of doctrine and worship claim your careful attention in connection with these subjects. It is of the utmost importance that our faith and practice should be represented, both to the ancient Churches and to the native and growing Churches in the mission-field, in a manner which shall neither give cause for offence nor restrict due liberty, nor present any stumbling-blocks in the way of complete communion.

In conformity with the practice of the former Conferences we declare that we are united under our Divine Head in the fellowship of the one Catholic and Apostolic Church, holding the one Faith revealed in Holy Writ, defined in the Creeds, maintained by the primitive Church, and affirmed by the undisputed Œcumenical Councils; as standards of doctrine and worship alike we recognise the

Prayer Book with its Catechism, the Ordinal, and the Thirty-nine Articles—the special heritage of the Church of England, and, to a greater or less extent, received by all the Churches of our Communion.

We desire that these standards should be set before the foreign Churches in their purity and simplicity. A certain liberty of treatment must be extended to the cases of native and growing Churches, on which it would be unreasonable to impose, as conditions of communion, the whole of the Thirty-nine Articles, coloured as they are in language and form by the peculiar circumstances under which they were originally drawn up. On the other hand it would be impossible for us to share with them in the matter of Holy Orders, as in complete intercommunion, without satisfactory evidence that they hold substantially the same form of doctrine as ourselves. It ought not to be difficult, much less impossible, to formulate articles, in accordance with our own standards of doctrine and worship, the acceptance of which should be required of all ordained in such Churches.

We close this letter rendering our humble and hearty thanks to Almighty God for His great goodness towards us. We have been permitted to meet together in larger numbers than heretofore. Contributions of knowledge and experience have been poured into the common stock from all parts of the earth. We have realised, more fully than it was possible to realise before, the extent, the power, and the influence of the great Anglican Communion. We have felt its capacities, its opportunities, its privileges. In our common deliberations we have tested its essential oneness amidst all varieties of condition and development. Wherever there was diversity of opinion among us there was also harmony of spirit and unity of aim; and we shall return to our several Dioceses refreshed, strengthened, and inspired by the memories which we shall carry away.

But the sense of thanksgiving is closely linked with the

obligation of duty. This fuller realisation of our privileges as members of the Anglican Communion carries with it a heightened sense of our responsibilities which do not end with our own people or with the mission-field alone, but extend to all the Churches of God. The opportunities of an exceptional position call us to an exceptional work. It is our earnest prayer that all—Clergy and laity alike—may take God's manifest purpose to heart, and strive in their several stations to work it out in all its fulness.

With these parting words we commend the results at which we have arrived in this Conference to your careful consideration, praying that the Holy Spirit may direct your thoughts and lead you to all truth, and that our counsels may redound through your action to the glory of God and the increase of Christ's kingdom.

Signed, on behalf of the Conference,

EDW: CANTUAR:

C. J. GLOUCESTER & BRISTOL,
Episcopal Secretary.

RANDALL T. DAVIDSON, Dean of Windsor,
General Secretary.

B. F. SMITH, Archdeacon of Maidstone,
Assistant Secretary.

27*th July*, 1888.

IX.

RESOLUTIONS FORMALLY ADOPTED BY THE CONFERENCE OF 1888. (See p. 36.)

1. That this Conference, without pledging itself to all the statements and opinions embodied in the Report of the Committee on Intemperance, commends the Report to the consideration of the Church.[1]

2. That the Bishops assembled in this Conference declare that the use of unfermented juice of the grape, or any liquid other than true wine diluted or undiluted, as the element in the administration of the cup in Holy Communion, is unwarranted by the example of Our Lord, and is an unauthorised departure from the custom of the Catholic Church.

---

3. That this Conference earnestly commends to all those into whose hands it may come the Report on the subject of Purity, as expressing the mind of the Conference on this great subject.[2]

---

4. (A) That, inasmuch as Our Lord's words expressly forbid Divorce, except in the case of fornication or adultery, the Christian Church cannot recognise Divorce in any other than the excepted case, or give any sanction to the marriage of any person who has been divorced contrary to this law, during the life of the other party.

(B) That under no circumstances ought the guilty party, in the case of a divorce for fornication or adultery, to be

[1] See p. 125. [2] Carried unanimously. See p. 130.

regarded, during the life-time of the innocent party, as a fit recipient of the blessing of the Church on marriage.

(c) That, recognising the fact that there always has been a difference of opinion in the Church on the question whether Our Lord meant to forbid marriage to the innocent party in a divorce for adultery, the Conference recommends that the Clergy should not be instructed to refuse the Sacraments or other privileges of the Church to those who, under civil sanction, are thus married.

---

5. (a) That it is the opinion of this Conference that persons living in polygamy be not admitted to baptism, but that they be accepted as candidates and kept under Christian instruction until such time as they shall be in a position to accept the law of Christ.[1]

(b) That the wives of polygamists may, in the opinion of this Conference, be admitted in some cases to baptism, but that it must be left to the local authorities of the Church to decide under what circumstances they may be baptised.[2]

---

6. (a) That the principle of the religious observance of one day in seven, embodied in the Fourth Commandment, is of Divine obligation.

(b) That, from the time of our Lord's Resurrection, the first day of the week was observed by Christians as a day of worship and rest, and, under the name of "The Lord's Day," gradually succeeded, as the great weekly festival of the Christian Church, to the sacred position of the Sabbath.

(c) That the observance of the Lord's Day as a day of rest, of worship, and of religious teaching, has been a priceless blessing in all Christian lands in which it has been maintained.

(d) That the growing laxity in its observance threatens a great change in its sacred and beneficent character.

[1] Carried by 83 votes to 21.
[2] Carried by 54 votes to 34.

(E) That especially the increasing practice, on the part of some of the wealthy and leisurely classes, of making Sunday a day of secular amusement is most strongly to be deprecated.

(F) That the most careful regard should be had to the danger of any encroachment upon the rest which, on this day, is the right of servants as well as their masters, and of the working classes as well as their employers.

---

7. That this Conference receives the Report drawn up by the Committee on the subject of Socialism, and submits it to the consideration of the Churches of the Anglican Communion.[1]

---

8. That this Conference receives the Report drawn up by the Committee on the subject of Emigration, and commends the suggestions embodied in it to the consideration of the Churches of the Anglican Communion.[2]

---

9. (A) That this Conference receives the Report drawn up by the Committee on the subject of the Mutual Relations of Dioceses and Branches of the Anglican Communion, and submits it to the consideration of the Church, as containing suggestions of much practical importance.[3]

(B) That the Archbishop of Canterbury be requested to give his attention to the Appendix attached to the Report, with a view to action in the direction indicated, if, upon consideration, His Grace should think such action desirable.

10. That, inasmuch as the Book of Common Prayer is not the possession of one Diocese or Province, but of all, and that a revision in one portion of the Anglican Communion must therefore be extensively felt, this Conference is of opinion that no particular portion of the Church should undertake revision without seriously considering the possible effect of such action on other branches of the Church.

---

[1] See p. 136. [2] See p. 141. [3] See p. 149.

11. That, in the opinion of this Conference, the following Articles supply a basis on which approach may be by God's blessing made towards Home Reunion:—

(A) The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as "containing all things necessary to salvation," and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith.

(B) The Apostles' Creed, as the Baptismal Symbol; and the Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith.

(C) The two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of Institution, and of the elements ordained by Him.

(D) The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the Unity of His Church.

12. That this Conference earnestly requests the constituted authorities of the various branches of our Communion, acting, so far as may be, in concert with one another, to make it known that they hold themselves in readiness to enter into brotherly conference (such as that which has already been proposed by the Church in the United States of America) with the representatives of other Christian Communions in the English-speaking races, in order to consider what steps can be taken, either towards corporate Reunion, or towards such relations as may prepare the way for fuller organic unity hereafter.

13. That this Conference recommends as of great importance, in tending to bring about Reunion, the dissemination of information respecting the standards of doctrine and the formularies in use in the Anglican Church; and recommends that information be disseminated, on the other hand, respecting the authoritative standards of doctrine, worship, and government adopted by the other bodies of Christians into which the English-speaking races are divided.

14. That, in the opinion of this Conference, earnest efforts

should be made to establish more friendly relations between the Scandinavian and Anglican Churches; and that approaches on the part of the Swedish Church, with a view to the mutual explanation of differences, be most gladly welcomed, in order to the ultimate establishment, if possible, of intercommunion on sound principles of ecclesiastical polity.

15. (A) That this Conference recognises with thankfulness the dignified and independent position of the Old Catholic Church of Holland, and looks to more frequent brotherly intercourse to remove many of the barriers which at present separate us.[1]

(B) That we regard it as a duty to promote friendly relations with the Old Catholic Community in Germany, and with the "Christian Catholic Church" in Switzerland, not only out of sympathy with them, but also in thankfulness to God Who has strengthened them to suffer for the truth under great discouragements, difficulties, and temptations; and that we offer them the privileges recommended by the Committee under the conditions specified in its Report.[1]

(C) That the sacrifices made by the Old Catholics in Austria deserve our sympathy, and that we hope, when their organisation is sufficiently tried and complete, a more formal relation may be found possible.[1]

(D) That, with regard to the reformers in Italy, France, Spain, and Portugal, struggling to free themselves from the burden of unlawful terms of communion, we trust that they may be enabled to adopt such sound forms of doctrine and discipline, and to secure such Catholic organisation as will permit us to give them a fuller recognition.[1]

(E) That, without desiring to interfere with the rights of Bishops of the Catholic Church to interpose in cases of extreme necessity, we deprecate any action that does not regard primitive and established principles of jurisdiction and the interests of the whole Anglican Communion.[1]

16. That, having regard to the fact that the question of the relation of the Anglican Church to the *Unitas Fratrum*,

[1] Resolutions (A) (B) (C) (D) (E) were carried *nemine contradicente*.

or Moravians, was remitted by the last Lambeth Conference to a Committee, which has hitherto presented no Report on the subject, the Archbishop of Canterbury be requested to appoint a Committee of Bishops who shall be empowered to confer with learned theologians, and with the heads of the *Unitas Fratrum*, and shall report to His Grace before the end of the current year, and that His Grace be requested to take such action on their Report as he shall deem right.

17. That this Conference, rejoicing in the friendly communications which have passed between the Archbishops of Canterbury and other Anglican Bishops, and the Patriarchs of Constantinople and other Eastern Patriarchs and Bishops, desires to express its hope that the barriers to fuller communion may be, in course of time, removed by further intercourse and extended enlightenment. The Conference commends this subject to the devout prayers of the faithful, and recommends that the counsels and efforts of our fellow-Christians should be directed to the encouragement of internal reformation in the Eastern Churches, rather than to the drawing away from them of individual members of their Communion.

18. That the Archbishop of Canterbury be requested to take counsel with such persons as he may see fit to consult, with a view to ascertaining whether it is desirable to revise the English version of the Nicene Creed or of the *Quicunque Vult*.[1]

19. That, as regards newly-constituted Churches, especially in non-Christian lands, it should be a condition of the recognition of them as in complete intercommunion with us, and especially of their receiving from us Episcopal Succession, that we should first receive from them satisfactory evidence that they hold substantially the same doctrine as our own, and that their Clergy subscribe Articles in accordance with the express statements of our own standards of doctrine and worship; but that they should not necessarily be bound to accept in their entirety the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion.

[1] Carried by 57 votes to 20.

X.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES, 1888. (See p. 36.)

N.B.—*The following Reports must be taken as having the authority only of the Committees by whom they were respectively prepared and presented. The Committees were not in every case unanimous in adopting the Reports.*

The Conference, as a whole, is responsible only for the formal Resolutions agreed to after discussion, and printed above, pages 119 *to* 124.

No. 1.—INTEMPERANCE.

Report of the Committee[1] *appointed to consider the subject of the Duty of the Church with Regard to Intemperance.*

It is not necessary to say much of the sinfulness of intemperance in itself, or of the widespread mischief that is caused by it. If it cannot be considered the most sinful of all sins, it is difficult to deny that it is the most mischievous. And wherever large masses of the population find it difficult to obtain work at all, and large masses can only obtain it at wages too low to sustain healthy life, the evils caused by intemperance press with heavier weight than ever they did before. The Church cannot be justified in witnessing this enormous amount of sin and misery without endeavouring to ascertain whether any special means can be discovered for

[1] Names of the Members of the Committee:—

Bishop of London (*Chairman*).
" Colorado.
" Kilmore.
" Newcastle.
" The Niger.
" Pennsylvania.
Bishop of Rochester.
" Saskatchewan.
" Sierra Leone.
" Sodor and Man.
" Zululand.

effectually dealing with it, or whether it must be left to ordinary agencies used with more than ordinary zeal and persistency.

The experience of the last fifty years is strongly in favour of the use of the special means which have hitherto achieved whatever success has been achieved in stemming the strong current of this widely-prevailing sin. It may be true that, if the whole Church had been thoroughly alive to the extent and nature of the mischief, much might have been done by more earnest efforts both of Clergy and Laity in the ordinary course of the Church's work. But it is the perseverance and insistence of the Temperance Societies that has awakened the Church, and without these Societies we have no evidence to show that much or even anything would have been done to deal with the evil. The Temperance Societies have compelled the attention of the public at large, and have by so doing profoundly modified public opinion. There can be no doubt that drunkenness is now regarded with much more severe condemnation than before these Societies began their work, and the change is largely, if not entirely, due to them. The Temperance Societies have compelled the medical profession to study the subject with more care than before, and the result of this study has greatly influenced both their utterances and their practice. The science of medicine is so complex and difficult, and the practice of medicine has been so largely influenced by tradition, that any particular question, such as that of the influence of alcohol on the body, has to wait its turn for examination unless some strong reason forces it forward. But the urgency of the Temperance Societies drew the attention of the profession, and the result has justified that urgency. To the Temperance Societies is due the change in the practice of Insurance Offices. Fifty years ago it was their ordinary rule to require higher premiums from life-insurers who totally abstained from intoxicating liquors. It is now proved that the total abstainers live longer than other men. And this has been confirmed by the experience of the Benefit Societies among which those that make total abstinence a condition of membership are able to show a much smaller average of sickness than the others. And to all this is to be added the great and still-increasing effect of the Bands of Hope which, though in some cases open to objection, are, nevertheless, every year adding largely to the number of pledged abstainers among adults, and bid fair before long entirely to change the public opinion of the classes that live by manual labour.

And it is natural that this should be so, for the sin, being one of the sins of the flesh, must be dealt with, as indeed all such sins must be dealt with, mainly by flight from temptation. The special characteristic of all temptations of the flesh is the enormous difference in power between temptations close at hand and tempta-

tions at a distance. If a man is weak in this respect the one hope of his safety lies in keeping the temptation from him, and him from the temptation. There are no doubt many who have no need of this. But those who have fallen or are approaching a fall can, as a rule, be upheld in no other way. Now, this is precisely a work in which men can help each other, and in which that help can most effectually be given by an organisation formed for the purpose. Men can help each other by breaking through those customs of society which now surround men with incessant temptations in every transaction of life, by using their influence to diminish the enormous number of public-houses which now make every street and road a peril to the weak, by diligently investigating the effects of alcoholic drinks on the body, and disproving the assertion that alcohol is necessary (except in rare and special cases) to health or to vigorous action. But even more can men help the weak by sympathy with them in their struggle, and by doing all they can to make that struggle easier. A weak man is told to abstain altogether; and, easy as this is to many, to some it is exceedingly difficult, and the difficulty to these is greatly increased if they are to abstain quite alone, and thus, apparently, cut themselves off from the rest; if their abstinence is, in itself, to be a kind of stigma, and to brand them with a public exposure of their weakness. Such men need to be shielded and supported by the stronger, or the battle which is often hard enough in any case becomes too much for their strength.

Whatever may be said concerning what might have been done by other methods, it is undeniable that to organisations for the express purpose of dealing with intemperance, and to these organisations alone, must be attributed what has been done. And if any other method of doing the work is to claim precedence it must first establish that claim by actual experience before it will be possible to take cognisance of it in determining the course that the authorities of the Church should recommend. The Temperance Societies are now doing the work, and there is at present no sign of any other mode of doing it being equally likely to succeed.

And after what has been said above it clearly follows that the main weapon to be used in this warfare is the practice of total abstinence from intoxicating liquors by those who desire to help their fellow-men. Nothing but this has the same hold of the weak or the tempted, gives them the same encouragement to fight their battle in the only true way, wins their affections, maintains their perseverance. Exhortations to total abstinence by those who do not themselves abstain are always comparatively feeble, sometimes irritating. The exhorter often fails to win even where perhaps he succeeds in convincing. The lesson that he teaches is that of moderation, which is an excellent lesson for the strong, but not

the lesson which is needed by the weak. He may do something to prevent some from falling who now stand upright; he can do little to save those who are on the edge, or to rescue those who have fallen already.

The burden of the work must be borne by those who are willing to abstain entirely. But, on the other hand, it cannot be said that everyone is bound to take up this particular burden as part of his service to Christ. Some are called to one form of devotion, some to another. There can be no question that everyone who abstains, and makes it known that he abstains for the sake of his weaker fellow-men, is giving them help, and in some cases more help than he knows, yet while men are all bound to help their fellows, they are not all bound to help them in the same manner or in the same degree or against the same enemies. All are bound to help the foreign mission work of the Church, but not all are bound to be missionaries. All are bound to help in spiritual work at home, but all are not called to the same spiritual work. All are bound to help the weak in their battle with intemperance, but not all to help them by total abstinence in their own persons.

It seems reasonable, however, to say that those who are brought much into contact with intemperance should arm themselves with this weapon of total abstinence in their own persons. It would be well that wherever this battle with intemperance is of exceptional importance, or forms for the time the first duty imposed on the Clergy, total abstinence should be the weapon employed. This applies not only to England, but still more to many places in other parts of the world where native races have to be rescued from previous habits of intemperance, or to be upheld in their struggle to resist temptations of this kind.

There is, however, much work to be done in this cause outside the direct battle with intemperance itself. And the Church cannot stand aloof from it.

It seems to belong to the Church to use its utmost influence to press on all Governments the duty of diminishing the enormous amount of temptation which at present hinders the work of elevating and civilising the masses. There can be no doubt that wise legislation might do a great deal in this direction. The diminution in the number of Public Houses, the shortening of the hours of sale, Sunday Closing, are instances of legislative measures that would probably be very beneficial. And a combination between Governments might wipe out the grievous stain which now rests on the countries that are counted foremost in the world—the stain of degrading and destroying the weaker races. It has pleased God to make the Christian nations stronger than any other—stronger than all others combined. But this strength brings with it a very solemn responsibility. And this solemn

responsibility the Church ought incessantly to press on those who bear authority. It is grievous that it should be possible to say, with any most distant resemblance of truth, that it would be better for native races that Christian nations should never come into contact with them at all.

In conclusion, it is of importance to lay much stress on the essential condition of permanent success in this work, namely, that it should be taken up in a religious spirit as part of Christian devotion to the Lord. The work must be done in His Name for the sake of His children whom He has bought with His Blood. A brief success may be obtained by forgetting the religious character of the task and thinking only of the misery which intemperance causes, and of the degradation inherent in it. But the religious spirit alone will maintain the conflict steadily through the obstinate resistance that will have to be encountered, and in spite of the many disappointments and failures that will have to be borne.

It is, again, the religious spirit which can alone repress the fanaticism which sometimes makes the total abstainer talk of his abstinence as the one thing needful; which sometimes makes him uncharitable and presumptuous; which sometimes makes him think lightly of grievous sin, provided it be not the one sin which he condemns.

But taken up in a religious spirit this work has a double blessing. It is not only blessed in the victory over sin and evil, but blessed also, and perhaps still more, in the door which it opens for the whole Gospel to enter men's souls. The conscience of the mass of the people speaks more clearly on this point than, perhaps, on any other. The Minister of the Gospel who begins with this finds that a very large number are at once ready to accept his teaching, because he carries their consciences with him from the first. They have already learnt that intemperance is wrong, and they are ready to believe in the value of a Ministry which visibly and systematically wages war on it. And having learnt to trust and follow the Minister in this, they are far more ready to trust and follow him in all else. To be all things to all men, in order that he might save some, was St. Paul's rule. And as things now are in many parishes, and in many parts of the world, the same rule will be best kept by those Ministers of the Church who make a point of showing themselves thoroughly in earnest in this great battle.

Signed on behalf of the Committee,

F. LONDIN:

Chairman.

No. 2.—PURITY.

Report of the Committee[1] *Appointed to Consider the Church's Practical Work in Relation to the Subject of Purity.*

In submitting the following Report your Committee would observe that they have cast it in such a form that, if accepted, it may go forth as the utterance of the united Conference.

We speak as those who are deeply conscious of their responsibility before God for the words which they utter upon a subject of tremendous moment.

Knowing, as we do know, how sins of impurity are not only a grave public scandal, but are also festering beneath the surface, and eating into the life of multitudes in all classes and in all lands, we cannot keep silence, although we dare not utter all that we know.

We are constrained, as Bishops of the Church of God, to lift up the standard of a high and pure morality, and we call upon all, whether of our own Communion or not, in the name of God our common Father, to rally round this standard. Especially do we press upon those on whom lies the responsibility of the cure of souls, to face the question, and to ask themselves what they are doing, or can do, to protect their flocks from the deadly ravages of sensual sin.

We believe that, although the public conscience is in some degree awakened, and the self-sacrificing efforts of those who have laboured to this end have not been wholly in vain, yet the awful magnitude of the evil is but imperfectly realised.

We are not blind to the danger of dealing publicly with the subject of impurity. We dread the effect, especially upon the young, of any increased familiarity with the details of sin. Notwithstanding we hold that the time has come when the Church must speak with no uncertain voice.

We solemnly declare that a life of purity is alone worthy of a being created in the image of God.

We declare that for Christians the obligation to purity rests

[1] Names of the Members of the Committee:—

Bishop of Durham. (*Chairman*).	Bishop of North Dakota.
,, Brechin.	,, Shrewsbury.
,, Calcutta.	,, Toronto.
,, Carlisle.	,, Truro.
,, Marlborough.	,, Wakefield.
,, Massachusetts.	

upon the sanctity of the body, which is the "Temple of the Holy Ghost."

We declare that a life of chastity for the unmarried is not only possible, but is commanded by God.

We declare that there is no difference between man and woman in the sinfulness of sins of unchastity.

We declare that on the man, in his God-given strength of manhood, rests the main responsibility.

We declare that no one known to be living an immoral life ought to be received in Christian society.

We solemnly protest against all lowering of the sanctity of marriage.

We would remind all whom our voice may reach that the wrath of God, alike in holy Scripture and in the history of the world, has been revealed against the nations which have transgressed the law of purity; and we solemnly record our conviction that, wherever marriage is dishonoured and sins of the flesh are lightly regarded, the home-life will be destroyed, and the nation itself will, sooner or later, decay and perish.

We, on our part, as Bishops of the Church of God, satisfied as to the gravity of this matter, and feeling that nothing short of general action on the part of all Christian people will avail to arrest the evil, determine to confer with the Clergy and faithful Laity of our several Dioceses as to the wisest steps to be taken for the accomplishment of the weighty enterprise to which God is calling us.

We believe that we may profitably deliberate upon such questions as the following:—

1. How best to bring about a general reformation of manners, and to enforce a higher moral tone in the matter of purity.

2. How especially to guard the sanctity of marriage, and to create a healthier public opinion upon the subject, and, to this end, how best to make the celebration of Holy Matrimony as reverent and impressive as possible.

3. How most wisely to deal with this difficult and delicate question as regards our children, our homes, our schools, and other places of education.

4. How best to strengthen the hands of those who are striving in the Army, the Navy, and other public services, to create and maintain a high standard of purity.

5. How best to provide safeguards for those who, from inability to marry, or from other circumstances of their lives, are exposed to special temptation.

6. How best to bind together, and to encourage by the sense of union, all who desire to help, or to be helped, in the battle against impurity.

7. How best to purify art and literature, and to repress all that is immodest in language, manners, and dress.

8. How best to enforce or amend the laws framed to guard the innocent, to punish the guilty, to rescue the fallen, to suppress the haunts of vice, and to remove temptation from our thoroughfares.

We thank God for the readiness, and even enthusiasm, with which the movement in favour of purity has been welcomed by young men of every class. There is a generosity and chivalry among the young which is seldom appealed to in vain; while large numbers are deeply thankful for every aid in the desperate battle against the sins of the flesh.

Once more, as witnesses for God, we would speak to all whom our voice may reach. "Be strong in the Lord, and in the power of His might." Live pure lives. Speak pure words. Think pure thoughts. Shun and abhor all that is not of perfect modesty. Guard with all jealousy the weak and the young. Above all pray for the sanctifying grace of the Holy Spirit of God, "that your whole spirit and soul and body may be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Signed on behalf of the Committee,

J. B. DUNELM.,

Chairman.

No. 3.—DIVORCE.

Report of the Committee[1] *Appointed to Consider the Subject of Divorce.*

The Committee appointed to consider the subject of "Divorce, and the question whether it may be practicable to offer any advice or suggestion which may help the Bishops and Clergy towards agreement in their action concerning it," report as follows:—

They think it necessary to call attention to the fact that in very many Christian nations there is evidently a growing laxity of principle and of practice with regard to Divorce, and that in some countries strong attempts have been made to afford further facilities for it, with the result of weakening and lowering, both in law and in popular sentiment, the idea of the sanctity of marriage.

[1] Names of the Members of the Committee:—

Bishop of Chester (*Chairman*).	Bishop of Huron.
,, Bombay.	,, Maryland.
,, Dover.	,, Mississippi.
,, Durham.	,, Quincy.
,, Exeter.	,, Singapore.

1. They therefore consider it important to declare that, inasmuch as our Lord's words expressly forbid Divorce, except in the case of fornication or adultery, the Christian Church cannot recognise Divorce in any other than the excepted case, or give any sanction to the marriage of any person who has been divorced contrary to this law, during the life of the other party.

2. They would add that under no circumstances ought the guilty party, in a case of Divorce for fornication or adultery, to be regarded, during the lifetime of the innocent party, as a fit recipient of the blessing of the Church on marriage.

3. They recognise the fact that there always has been a difference of opinion in the Church on the question whether our Lord meant to forbid marriage to the innocent party in a Divorce for adultery: and they recommend that the Clergy should not be instructed to refuse the Sacraments or other privileges of the Church to those who, under civil sanction, are thus married.

4. But whereas doubt has been entertained whether our Lord meant to permit such marriage to the innocent party, the Committee are unwilling to suggest any precise instructions in this matter, and recommend that, where the laws of the land will permit, the determination should be left to the judgment of the Bishop of the Diocese, whether the Clergy would be justified in refraining from pronouncing the blessing of the Church on such unions.

Signed on behalf of the Committee,

W. CESTR:

Chairman.

No. 4.—POLYGAMY.

Report of the Committee[1] *Appointed to Consider the Subject of Polygamy of Heathen Converts.*

Your Committee have approached the consideration of the subject submitted to them with an overwhelming sense of their responsi-

[1] Names of the Members of the Committee:—

Bishop of Durham (*Chairman*).
" Central Africa.
" Chester.
" Exeter.
" Guiana.
" London.
" Meath.
" Missouri.
Bishop of The Niger.
Bishop Perry.
Bishop of Sierra Leone.
" South Dakota.
" Travancore.
" Waiapu.
" Zululand.

bilities; inasmuch as the question intimately affects the sanctity of marriage, and therefore lies at the root of social morality.

After considering various representations which have been laid before them from divers quarters, they beg leave to report as follows:—

1. Your Committee desire to affirm distinctly that Polygamy is inconsistent with the law of Christ respecting marriage.

2. They cannot find that either the law of Christ or the usage of the early Church would permit the baptism of any man living in the practice of polygamy, even though the polygamous alliances should have been contracted before his conversion.

3. They are well aware that the change from polygamy to monogamy must frequently involve great difficulty and even hardship, but they are of opinion that it is not possible to lay down a precise rule to be observed under all circumstances in dealing with this difficulty.

They consequently think that the question of time and manner, which must depend largely on local circumstances, can only be determined by local authority.

4. Your Committee recommend that persons living in polygamy should, on their conversion, be accepted as candidates for Baptism, and kept under Christian instruction until such time as they shall be in a position to accept the law of Christ.

They consider it far better that Baptism should be withheld from such persons, while nevertheless they receive instruction in the truths of the Gospel, than that a measure should be sanctioned which would tend to lower the conception of the Christian law of marriage, and thus inflict an irreparable wound on the morality of the Christian Church in its most vital part.

5. The wives of polygamists may, in the opinion of the Committee, be admitted, in some cases, to Baptism; inasmuch as their position is materially different from that of the polygamist husband. In most countries where polygamy prevails they have no personal freedom to contract or dissolve a matrimonial alliance; and moreover they presumably do not violate the Christian precept which enjoins fidelity to one husband.

6. In carrying into effect the principles here laid down, with due regard to the dictates of love and justice, serious burdens will in some cases be imposed on the Churches, but no trouble, or cost, or self-sacrifice, ought to be spared to make any suffering which may be caused as light and easy to bear as possible.

7. Difficult questions of detail which may arise in following these recommendations must be left to the decision of the local authorities of the Church, whether Diocesan or Provincial.

8. Throughout this Report polygamy has been taken to mean the union of one man with several wives; but among some tribes

the union of one woman with several husbands is a recognised institution. It will be plain that no such union can be recognised by the Church.

9. It has been represented to your Committee that heathen marriages in many cases do not imply a mutual pledge of life-long fidelity; and instruction has been asked as to the mode of dealing with such cases on the conversion of the contracting parties, so as to impart a Christian character to the contract. The Committee think it best to leave the local authorities of the Church to determine in what way this end may be best attained; but they deprecate any course which would tend to impair the validity (within their own sphere) of contracts undertaken prior to conversion, so far as these contracts are not inconsistent with the law of Christ.

10. In laying down the principles which should rule the admission of Christian converts for the future, the Committee have no intention of passing any censure on those who have decided otherwise in the past; and they desire to leave to individual Bishops the responsibility of dealing with difficulties which may arise in any part of the mission-field from the adoption of a different line of action heretofore by those in authority.

J. B. Dunelm.,

Chairman.

No. 5.—SUNDAY OBSERVANCE.

Report of the Committee[1] *Appointed to Consider the Subject of the Observance of Sunday.*

Your Committee have met, and prayerfully considered the subject of the sanctity and observance of the Lord's Day, and have agreed to the following statements of their deliberate judgment on this momentous question, which they submit as their Report:

1. That the principle of the religious observance of one day in seven is of Divine and primeval obligation, and was afterwards embodied in the Fourth Commandment.

2. That from the time of our Lord's Resurrection the first day

[1] Names of the Members of the Committee:—

Bishop of Exeter (*Chairman*).	Bishop of Indiana.
,, Argyll.	,, Liverpool.
,, Brisbane.	,, Wakefield.
,, Cashel.	,, Washington.

of the week was observed as a day of sacred joy by Christians, and was ere long adopted by the Church as the Christian Sabbath or "the Lord's Day."

3. That the observance of the Lord's Day as a day of rest, of worship, and of religious teaching, has been a priceless blessing in all Christian lands in which it has been maintained.

4. That the growing license in its observance threatens a grave change in its sacred and beneficent character.

5. That especially the increasing practice on the part of some of the wealthy and leisurely classes of making the day a day of secular amusement is most strongly to be deprecated.

6. That the most careful regard should be had to the danger of any encroachment upon the rest which on this day is the right of servants as well as their masters, and of the working classes as well as their employers.

Signed on behalf of the Committee,

E. H. Exon.,

Chairman.

No. 6.—SOCIALISM.

Report of the Committee[1] *Appointed to Consider the Subject of the Church's Practical Work in Relation to Socialism.*

This Committee was directed to report "on the Church's practical work in relation to Socialism." It will be desirable, therefore, in the first place, to ascertain, if possible, what is the meaning of Socialism. This, however, is not easy, as the word is used at present in very different senses. When Proudhon was asked, What is Socialism? he replied, "It is every aspiration towards the improvement of society." Laveleye remarks upon this answer, that "Proudhon's definition is too wide:—it omits two characteristics. In the first place, every socialistic doctrine aims at introducing greater equality into social conditions; and, secondly, it tries to realise those reforms by the action of the law or the

[1] Names of the Members of the Committee:—

Bishop of Manchester (*Chairman*).
" Brisbane.
" Carlisle.
" Derry.
" Michigan.
Bishop of Mississippi.
" Pittsburgh.
" Rochester.
" Sydney.
" Wakefield.

State." So far, however, as this definition makes the interference of the State a necessary element of Socialism, it is not universally accepted. Schäffle, for instance, says:—"The Alpha and Omega of Socialism is the transformation of private competing capitals into a united collective capital"; and T. Kirkup, in a thoughtful article on Socialism in the last edition of the Encyclopædia Britannica, affirms that "the central aim of Socialism is to terminate the divorce of the workers from the natural sources of subsistence and of culture;" and, again, he says, "the essence of the theory consists in this—associated production, with a collective capital, with the view to an equitable distribution." Speaking broadly, then, and with reference to such definitions as the preceding, any scheme of social reconstruction may be called Socialism which aims at uniting labour and the instruments of labour (land and capital), whether by means of the State, or of the help of the rich, or of the voluntary co-operation of the poor.

Between Socialism, as thus defined, and Christianity there is obviously no necessary contradiction. Christianity sets forth no theory of the distribution of the instruments or the products of labour; and if, therefore, some Socialists are found to be in opposition to the Christian religion, this must be due to the accidents and not to the essence of their social creed. Some Socialists are atheists, others advocate loose doctrines as to family ties, others, like the Anarchists, seek to realise their aims, so far as they have any, by undisguised murder and robbery, while, according to some, the very possession of private property is a usurpation and a wrong to the community. With such men the Christian Church can form no alliance. And yet at the same time with what they profess to be their central aim, the improvement of the material and moral condition of the poor, she must have the deepest sympathy. Their methods, indeed, are not hers. Spoliation or injustice in any form is abhorrent alike to her sentiment and belief. She has no faith in the inherent power of humanity to redeem itself from selfishness. She seeks to make men prosperous and wise and good, not by the force of laws or bayonets, but by the change of individual hearts, and the introduction of a new brotherhood in Christ.

Not the less, however, is she bound, following the teaching of her Master, to aid every wise endeavour which has for its object the material and moral welfare of the poor. Her Master taught her that all men are brethren, not because they share the same blood, but because they have a common Heavenly Father. He further taught her that if any of the members of this spiritual family were greater, richer, or better than the rest, they were bound to use their special means or ability in the service of the whole. "He that is greatest among you," He said, "shall be

your servant,"—and that for a special reason, because each disciple was found to imitate his Divine Master, "Who came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many."

The Church's practical duty, then, towards Socialism must be determined by the answer to this question, will the union of labour and the instruments of labour tend to improve the material, mental, and moral condition of mankind? Experience seems to show that it will.

It may still, however, be a question, what is the wisest *method* of bringing about this union between labour and its instruments? Two principal schemes have been proposed:—

(1) That labourers shall be encouraged in habits of thrift, in order that with the property thus acquired they may purchase land, or shares in societies for co-operative production.

(2) That the State shall take possession of the whole land and capital of any country, with or without compensation to their former owners; that the property thus nationalised shall be held in trust for the community by the State, the Commune, or associations of working men; that then the State, the Commune, or the association as the case may be, shall take measures for the preservation, increase, and employment of the common capital, requiring work from each man according to his ability, and bestowing property upon each man according to his needs, or the value of his labour. Minor modifications of this scheme, tending to bring it into closer harmony with the existing state of society, have been proposed by some Socialistic teachers, but still it may be taken as a substantially correct representation of the ultimate aim of very many.

To this second method of uniting labour and its instruments the Committee would urge the following objections:—(1) If full compensation were given to the present holders of property the scheme could hardly be realised, while if full compensation were withheld it would become one of undisguised spoliation. (2) If Government were able to acquire just possession of the whole property of a community, it is difficult to see how the affairs of any great commercial undertaking could be conducted by the State or the Commune with the energy, economy, and sagacious foresight which are necessary to secure success. (3) If all men had to work under State or Communal inspection and compulsion, it would be difficult for them to retain freedom, the sense of parental responsibility, and those numerous traits of individuality which give richness to the human character.

The Committee strongly recommend the adoption of the first-named method. They believe that it will be well to encourage working men to become possessors of small farms, and of shares

in societies for co-operative production in trade and agriculture. They are not unaware that these societies have frequently failed, but they believe that the opinion is not without its weight, that if due care be taken to secure efficient and trustworthy managers, to pay them an adequate salary, and to treat them with a generous confidence, there is no reason why such undertakings should not become successful, as indeed they commonly are now, when their management is in competent hands.

Two objections have been frequently advanced against this method of diminishing the present distress: first, that it is unjust to let anyone but the labourer obtain possession of any part of the products of his labour; and, secondly, that no man of property or ability ought to seek personal profit from the employment of his special advantages, or ought even to be allowed to become the permanent owner of either land or capital.

The first objection is not tenable. The Committee hold that it is just (1) to pay high wages for exceptional ability; (2) to compensate for his abstinence the man who refrains from consuming his own share of the products of labour, and by so doing makes it possible to maintain and increase the capital of the community; (3) to allow anyone to convert his savings into the form of capital or estate.

The second objection is really founded upon the general spirit of our Lord's teaching—viz., that greatness, ability, or wealth should be made the means of service to the poor and weak without special fee or reward. The Committee fully admit that this is the ideal set before us by our Divine Master, and that it is the end, towards which we should press, as quickly as the conquest of selfishness will allow us. But they hold that there is no surer cause of failure in practical affairs, than the effort to act on an ideal which has not yet been realised. If the Church is to act safely as well as sublimely, she must take the self-regarding motives with her on the long path by which she advances towards the perfect life of love. She must not assume the existence of what does not yet exist. She must not, like the Anarchists, destroy the whole existing framework of society for the sake of making experiments. Nay, more, she must not ignore the fact that self-regard is the necessary condition of self-preservation, and that her Master's law of moral conduct, that each shall love his neighbour as himself, implies a certain amount of self-regard. Competition is not injurious in itself, it only becomes so when it is unrestricted, when it takes no counsel of the dictates of brotherly love.

The Committee do not doubt that Government can do much to protect the class known as proletarians from the evil effects of unchecked competition. The English poor law has long ago provided the bare necessaries of life for those who cannot otherwise

obtain them; the institution of State Savings Banks has provided for the poor man a safe investment and moderate return for his savings. Acts of Parliament have required the builders and owners of houses to have regard for the health and comfort of their tenants, while the factory legislation of this country has effectually protected those labourers who cannot protect themselves. The Committee believe, further, that the State may justly and safely extend this protective action in several directions. It may legalise the formation of Boards of Arbitration, to avert the disastrous effects of strikes. It may assist in the formation and maintenance of technical schools. It may see that powers, already existing, under Sanitary Acts, are more effectually exercised. It may facilitate the acquisition by Municipalities of town lands. The State may even encourage a wider distribution of property by the abolition of entail, where it exists; and it may be questioned whether the system of taxation might not be varied in a sense more favourable to the claims of labourers than that which now exists.

But, after all, the best help is self-help. More even than increase of income, and security of deposit, thrift and self-restraint are the necessary elements of material prosperity. And in encouraging and strengthening such habits and feelings the Church's help is invaluable. By requiring some knowledge of economic science from her candidates for orders; by forming and fostering institutions for the provision of practical education and rational recreation; by establishing penny banks and workmen's guilds; above all, by inducing capitalists to admit their workmen to profit-sharing, and by teaching artisans how to make co-operative production successful, she may do much to diminish discontent, and to increase the feeling of brotherly interest between class and class. The Clergy may enter into friendly relations with Socialists, attending, when possible, their club meetings, and trying to understand their aims and methods. At the same time it will contribute no little to draw together the various classes of society if the Clergy endeavour, in sermons and lectures, to set forth the true principles of Society, showing how property is a trust to be administered for the good of humanity, and how much of what is good and true in Socialism is to be found in the precepts of Christ. The call to aid the weak, through works of what is ordinarily known as charity, has been, at all times, faithfully pressed by the Church of Christ, and has been met by a noble response, which has been the chief strength of works of beneficence in modern Society. But the matter is one, not merely of Charity, but of Social and Christian Duty. It is in this light that the Church has to proclaim it in these critical times, with some special boldness and earnestness. At the same time the word of warning should not be wanting. Mutual suspicion and the imputation of selfish and unworthy

motives keep apart those who have, in fact, a common aim. Intestine strife and doctrines of spoliation destroy confidence, arrest trade, and will but increase misery.

The Committee believe that, in the present condition of thought and knowledge, they cannot wisely or profitably go further than they have done above in the way of detailed suggestion. There is the less temptation to overhaste in forcing on social experiments, inasmuch as the history of the past shows convincingly that the principles of the Gospel contain germs from which Social renovation is surely, if slowly, developed by the continuous action of Christian thought and feeling upon every form of evil and suffering. If all will only labour, under the impulse of Christian love, for the highest benefit of each, we shall advance by the shortest possible path to that better and happier future for which our Master taught us to hope and pray.

Signed on behalf of the Committee,

J. MANCHESTER,

Chairman.

No. 7.—CARE OF EMIGRANTS.

Report of the Committee[1] *Appointed to Consider the Church's Practical Work in Relation to the Care of Emigrants.*

In considering the question of the practical work of the Church in relation to the Care of Emigrants, your Committee have limited their inquiries and the recommendations which they desire to submit to the judgment of the Conference, to those points which bear on the promotion of the religious and moral well-being of our emigrants. They are of opinion that the wider subject of

[1] Names of the Members of the Committee:—

Bishop of Llandaff (*Chairman*).	Bishop of North Dakota.
,, Algoma.	,, North Queensland.
,, Liverpool.	,, Pittsburgh.
,, Maritzburg.	,, Quebec.
,, Newark.	,, Rupertsland.
,, Niagara.	,, Sodor and Man.

encouraging and assisting emigration is outside the scope of their deliberations, and, even were this not the case, that it is far too large a question to be adequately dealt with in the time at their disposal.

I. In the first place, your Committee feel that they cannot too strongly emphasise the *vast importance of the subject* entrusted to them for consideration. They believe that the problem is one of the most urgent and pressing of the many problems with which the Church has to deal at the present day. And they cannot but think that before many years have passed away, the difficulties of dealing with the problem will be immeasurably increased; and thus it becomes of paramount necessity that the machinery for coping with these difficulties should be organised and set in motion while the extent of emigration is such as to render this possible.

When once the machinery is in good working order, it will then be capable of almost indefinite extension, to meet the increasing demands upon its capacities.

(*a*) Foremost among the reasons which point to the importance of due provision being made for the spiritual care of our emigrants is this:—Those who leave the British Isles and go forth to seek their fortune in new lands, choose, for the most part, either the United States of America, or Canada, or some of the Colonies of Australia. Of these a very large number are *children of one or another Branch of the Anglican Communion*, and, as such, have a right to expect that the Anglican Church will duly minister to them in whatever part of the world their lot may be cast. An enormous responsibility lies upon the Church in this matter, and it is her duty, so far as in her lies, to prevent estrangement, or any loss of spiritual life in her children, through the accident of their removal from one Branch of the Anglican Church to another.

(*b*) The simple consideration of the *very large number of emigrants* who have left and who are still leaving British Ports, is a sufficient indication of the immense responsibility of the Church towards them. Since the year of the Battle of Waterloo (1815) the total number of emigrants leaving the United Kingdom has been 11,740,573. But a truer estimate of the great increase in later years is shown from the fact that, during the last ten years, since the Lambeth Conference of 1878, 3,195,660 out of the above-named 11 millions have left this country. This gives an average of 319,566 emigrants per annum (including British subjects and foreigners). The average is, however, now greatly exceeded every year, as the following figures will show:—

British and Irish Emigrants who have left British Ports in the last 10 years,		*Total* number of Emigrants, including British subjects and Foreigners, who have left British Ports in the last 10 years.	
In 1878	112,902	In 1878	147,663
,, 1879	164,274	,, 1879	217,163
,, 1880	227,542	,, 1880	332,294
,, 1881	243,002	,, 1881	392,514
,, 1882	279,366	,, 1882	413,288
,, 1883	320,118	,, 1883	397,157
,, 1884	242,179	,, 1884	303,901
,, 1885	207,644	,, 1885	264,385
,, 1886	232,900	,, 1886	330,801
,, 1887	281,487	,, 1887	396,494
Total ...	2,311,414	*Total* ...	3,195,660
Average per Annum of British and Irish Emigrants.	231,141	Average per Annum of all Emigrants.	319,566

By far the largest proportion of emigrants go to the United States. The percentage, in 1887, to the three chief fields of emigration was as follows:—To the United States, 72 per cent.; to British North America, 11 per cent.; to the Australasian Colonies, 12 per cent.; to all other places, 5 per cent. The following table shows the distribution of the actual number of emigrants in 1887:—

Emigrants (British and Irish only) 1887.		Total Emigrants (British and Foreign) 1887.	
To the United States	201,526	To the United States	296,901
,, British North America ...	32,025	,, British North America ...	44,406
,, Australasia ...	34,183	,, Australasia ...	35,198
,, all other places ...	13,753	,, all other places ...	19,989
	281,487		396,494

Thus, very nearly three-fourths of the 396,494 people who left the United Kingdom last year were of British or Irish origin, whose spiritual interests the Church cannot properly disregard.

(*c*) A third reason for urging the importance of the care of our emigrants is the *danger to which they are exposed* between the time of their leaving their old home and the time when they are finally established in their new one.

The dangers on the voyage are by no means inconsiderable.

The impossibility, when 500 or more emigrants are carried in one vessel, of separating the reckless and careless from those who are thoughtful and well-disposed, exposes the latter to great temptations. This is especially the case with young unmarried women. Then, again, the dangers are no less great at the port of arrival, where young persons, among strangers and surroundings which are new and unknown, are liable to fall a prey to the unscrupulous men and women who are ever on the watch, at such times, to take advantage of ignorance and innocence. And, perhaps, the greatest danger of all arises from the temptations to intemperance and other vices to which the emigrants are exposed on arrival at their new settlement.

(*d*) One more point remains to be mentioned under this head, and that is, the enormous *value of the opportunity* afforded by the softening influence which is brought about by the severance of the associations of home and early life, for awakening religious impressions in those who have hitherto been insensible to the Church's teaching, as well as for deepening the spiritual life of those who are true Christians. Wherever this opportunity is taken advantage of, the result is seen in the strengthening of the Church in the country to which the emigrant goes.

Having thus dwelt upon some of the chief reasons why the spiritual care of emigrants is of such supreme importance, your Committee proceed to consider—

What work has already been done in this direction.

What work still remains to be done.

II. Work which has already been done.

Your Committee have pleasure in acknowledging what has already been accomplished in the establishment and continuance of moral and religious work among emigrants. The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge has organised a plan which is working with much success, and which, when further developed, promises to be of the highest value to the Church. Your Committee desire to express their hearty sense of the gratitude which is due for the admirable work carried on by that Society, which has always been at the head of all religious efforts on behalf of emigrants. They would also acknowledge with thankfulness the meritorious work which has been done by other Societies, especially at the Port of London, and notably that which has been undertaken by the St. Andrew's Waterside Mission.

Without being able to give a complete account of every attempt made to assist and benefit emigrants, it is gratifying to be able to point to the following efforts, which have been successfully carried out, and which have led to valuable results:—

(*a*) Chaplains have been appointed at all the ports of departure

in the United Kingdom, whose duty it is to minister to emigrants; to arrange services for them, both before starting and on the voyage; to give them introductions to Clergymen abroad; and generally to arrange for their reception by the Church in the new country to which they are travelling.

(*b*) The Church in the United States of America has initiated a most important work, in having appointed Chaplains at New York, Baltimore, and Philadelphia, whose duty it is to give such spiritual aid as is possible to arriving immigrants, and to commend them further to the Church at their ultimate destination inland.

(*c*) Chaplains who accompany emigrants on the voyage, and who minister to them, and hold frequent services on board, have also been appointed on many vessels going to America, Australia and New Zealand, and the Cape. The great value of having such Chaplains on board is evident, and this is especially the case on the long-voyage ships to Australia and the Cape. The financial burden of the remuneration of these Chaplains is borne by the S.P.C.K.

(*d*) In order to provide due protection for girls and single women emigrating, matrons (other than the regular Government Emigrant Matrons) have from time to time been appointed, who are required to look after their charges during the voyage and on arrival at their destination. The help derived from their protection and the moral influence of the matrons has been largely felt. In this branch of the work your Committee desire to acknowledge the valuable services rendered by the Girls' Friendly Society.

(*e*) Clergymen living in all parts of the world have consented to allow persons emigrating to be specially commended to them by letter, and they have given valuable assistance and advice to emigrants when first settling in a new country.

(*f*) The publication of some thousands of handbooks for the use of emigrants has in the past proved a valuable help to them. These books contain particulars about the various Colonies, and other matters likely to be of assistance. The recent establishment by the English Government of an "Emigrants' Information Office," where books, leaflets, and information may be had, is found to be of very great service.

(*g*) A large number of books (Bibles, Prayer-books, and other books of a religious or interesting nature) have been provided for the emigrants on their outward voyage. Many of these have been given away, and in this manner religious teaching and influence have been brought to bear upon them.

(*h*) Forms of Letters of Commendation for the use of emigrants have been issued in large numbers,[1] and it is most desirable that Clergymen should provide themselves with these letters. The

[1] For a copy of this Form, see Schedule A, p. 148.

Clergyman of the parish in which the intending emigrant resides should fill up such forms, and address to a Bishop or Clergyman of the Church abroad, where the emigrant intends to settle. Where these letters have been given, they have been proved to be of real value, as forming a link between home and foreign countries, and securing for the emigrant a welcome from the Church.

III. Work still remaining to be done.

Your Committee consider that, notwithstanding the praiseworthy efforts made and carried out, for the moral and spiritual welfare of emigrants, a very large and increasing amount of work lies before the Church, which calls for immediate, earnest, and united action on the part of every branch of the Anglican Communion. They consider that this work may be attempted in two ways: (i.) as a development and improvement of existing organisations; and (ii.) as a new departure.

(A) Under the head of the *development of organisations* which already exist, your Committee would mention the following suggestions which seem to be of importance:—

(1) That the English Bishops should impress upon the Parochial Clergy, at Diocesan Conferences and on other occasions, the solemn duty (*a*) of providing that not one of their Parishioners be allowed to leave home without being provided with a Letter of Commendation to the Church abroad, stating particularly whether they have been baptised and confirmed, or are communicants; (*b*) of informing intending emigrants that the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America is the only Church in the United States which is in full communion with the Church of England.

(2) That it is expedient that letters should be sent from England (in addition to the above Commendatory Letters), to precede the emigrant on his journey out. These letters should be sent to the Bishop abroad, and should give notice of the intended arrival of the emigrant, adding such information with regard to character and qualifications as may be of assistance to the Bishop or Clergyman to whom the emigrant is commended.

(3) That the Bishops in the Colonies and in the United States of America be urged to press upon their Clergy the duty of prompt attention to such Commendatory Letters as may be presented to them from emigrants, either directly or through the Bishops.

(4) That the attention of the Church in the United States be called to the extreme desirability and need of at once increasing the number of immigrant Chaplains at New York and other ports, where at present the number of emigrants makes it impossible for the existing staff to minister adequately to those who arrive. At New York especially it would seem that these increased Church ministrations should be supplied with as little delay as possible.

(5) That, with the view of increasing the number of Chaplains who shall accompany emigrants on the voyage, the Clergy should be specially invited, when travelling to the Colonies, to take every opportunity of acting as Chaplains on board emigrant ships.[1]

(6) That, in consideration of the great influence exercised upon emigrants by the Government Matron on board ship, it is important that care be taken in the selection of good Christian women for the office.

(B) Your Committee feel that the work which has already been attempted for the spiritual welfare of our emigrants has been carried out by the best methods, and therefore their recommendations for the future have been mainly devoted to the development and extension of existing organisations.

They would, however, suggest for consideration the following four *points of new departure*, as being, in their opinion, of paramount importance at the present time:

(1) That the Church in Australasia and in Canada be urged to provide more adequate spiritual ministrations for immigrants at the ports of arrival, by the appointment of Chaplains whose whole time could, if necessary, be devoted to the work.

(2) That it is most desirable to establish homes for emigrants at the ports of departure and arrival, where those needing protection or care may be received.

(3) That the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the Bishop of London be requested to prepare a Form of Prayer for Use at Sea, having regard to the special needs of emigrants.

(4) That it would be of great service if more frequent and regular interchange of reports of work done, and of the requirements in respect of emigrants, could take place between the Church in England and the Church in the United States and in the Colonies.

Your Committee cannot bring their report to a close without expressing their deep thankfulness to Almighty God for the measure of success which has hitherto attended the Church in her efforts on behalf of her emigrants, and an earnest prayer for the guidance and blessing of the Holy Spirit in the years to come.

Signed on behalf of the Committee,

R. Llandaff,

Chairman.

[1] Full information as to the duties of such Chaplains, and of the remuneration which can in some cases be offered them, is obtainable from the S.P.C.K.

SCHEDULE A.

[FORM OF COMMENDATORY LETTER.]

.....

Reverend and dear Sir,

I desire herewith to commend to your pastoral care and brotherly good offices ..... *from the Parish of* ..... *in the Diocese of* ..... *who is about to settle in* .....

And I certify that [1] .....

.....

.....

.....

Dated this .....

[1] *Here state whether baptised, confirmed, or a Communicant.*

[S.P.C.K.]

No. 8.—MUTUAL RELATIONS.

Report of the Committee[1] *Appointed to Consider the Subject of the Mutual Relations of the Dioceses and Branches of the Anglican Communion.*

The Committee feel that it would be impossible for them to deal in any complete and exhaustive manner with a subject so extensive as that which has been referred to them for consideration. They have therefore determined to confine their attention to such definite and practical points as have been brought under their notice, and as appear to them to be worthy of being made the subject of report.

I.—The attention of the Committee has been directed to alleged neglect of certain important principles which were laid down by the Lambeth Conference of 1878. The principles are contained in the following quotations:—

(1) First, that the duly-certified action of every national or particular Church, and of each ecclesiastical Province (or Diocese not included in a Province), in the exercise of its own discipline, should be respected by all the other Churches, and by their individual members.

(2) Secondly, that when a Diocese, or territorial sphere of administration, has been constituted by the authority of any Church or Province of this Communion within its own limits, no Bishop or other Clergyman of any other Church should exercise his functions within that Diocese, without the consent of the Bishop thereof.

(3) Thirdly, that no Bishop should authorise to officiate in his Diocese a Clergyman coming from another Church or Province unless such Clergyman present letters testimonial, countersigned by the Bishop of the Diocese

[1] Names of the Members of the Committee:—

Bishop of Carlisle (*Chairman*).
" Adelaide.
" Auckland.
" Brechin.
" Calcutta.
" Capetown.
" Central Pennsylvania.
" Chester.
" Colombo.
Bishop of Derry.
" Jamaica.
" Manchester.
" Moray and Ross.
" New Jersey.
" North China.
" Sierra Leone.
" Tennessee.

from which he comes, such letters to be as nearly as possible in the form adopted by such Church or Province in the case of the transfer of a Clergyman from one Diocese to another. (See above, p. 84.)

The Committee would urge that more attention should be paid by Metropolitans and Bishops, or persons temporarily administering the affairs of a Diocese, to the practical enforcement of the principles above enunciated; and they would add in particular the following recommendation—namely, that the Archbishop of Canterbury be respectfully requested to consider whether it be possible to devise and suggest any means whereby it may be made more easy to avoid the intrusion of unworthy or pretended Priests or Deacons into the various Dioceses of the Anglican Communion.

II. It has been brought under the notice of the Committee that difficulty has arisen with regard to the validity of orders derived from certain Bishops alleged to be schismatical. It would be exceedingly desirable that some definite and uniform course of action should be adopted by all Bishops of the Anglican Communion in dealing with persons holding such so-called orders.

The Committee are of opinion that, although much may have been said to the contrary, there are in reality no persons claiming Anglican Orders of doubtful character whose claims deserve serious consideration. With regard to Orders alleged to be derived, though irregularly, through the American Church, it may be sufficient to say that the whole transaction is disallowed and regarded as null and void by the American Episcopate. This fact, in the opinion of the Committee, may be taken as a sufficient guide to all Bishops of the Anglican Communion.

III. A question has been brought before the Committee, based upon a Report made to the General Synod of the Dioceses in Australia and Tasmania, on the subject of the title of Archbishop. The Committee have been asked to express an opinion as to the desirability of assigning the title of Archbishop to the Primate of Australia and Tasmania. The Committee feel that there is great difficulty in coming to a clear judgment upon a question which must, of necessity, to some extent depend for its answer upon local circumstances; but taking the question upon broad grounds, and looking to the general interests of the whole Church, the Committee have no hesitation in expressing their opinion that there are cases of important Provinces in which distinct advantages would result from adopting the ancient and honoured title of Archbishop. In the event of this course being adopted weighty questions might arise with regard to authority and precedence, but upon these questions the Committee think that it would be unwise to enter.

IV. The Committee have given anxious consideration to the

question of the formation of a central Council of Reference, to which recourse may be had for advice on questions of doctrine and discipline by the tribunals of appeal of the various Provinces of the Anglican Communion.

With reference to this question, which has already been before the Conferences of 1867 and 1878, the Committee think that they cannot do better than call attention to what has actually been done in the case of Australia and Tasmania.

The following resolutions were adopted by the General Synod of Australia and Tasmania in 1872:—

> If, in the opinion of the Committee of Appeal of the General Synod of the Church of England in Australia and Tasmania, the matter of appeal concerns a question of doctrine, or discipline involving a question of doctrine, the Committee may, at its discretion, state a case for the opinion thereon of a body in England, to be called the Council of Reference. Such Council of Reference shall consist of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and the Bishop of London, together with four laymen learned in the law, the first four such laymen being Lord Hatherley, Lord Chelmsford, Lord Cairns, and Lord Penzance. The General Synod shall have power to fill up vacancies as they shall from time to time occur, but in the event of a vacancy or vacancies existing when a case shall be before the Council, the Archbishops and Bishop shall fill up the same for the purpose of disposing of that particular case. The opinion of the Council shall be binding on the Committee, and pending the obtaining of such an opinion, the appeal shall stand adjourned, with liberty to either of the parties to set the appeal down to be disposed of upon the opinion when obtained. If from any cause it shall be impracticable to obtain an opinion from the Council of Reference within a time to be limited by the rules to be made under the resolutions, the Committee of its own motion may, or at the instance of either of the parties shall, determine the appeal; but in such case the concurrence of one of the two Bishops shall be requisite in any decision.

The Committee are of opinion that a plan of reference to a Council in England, framed upon such principles as those adopted by the General Synod of Australia and Tasmania, would probably meet the wants, should they arise, of other Provinces.

It has been brought to the attention of the Committee, that in some parts of the Anglican Communion, notably, in the Province of the West Indies, schemes somewhat different from that above described have been adopted. It is needless to say that the Com-

mittee do not desire to pass an opinion upon details, but only to indicate a general method of action.

V. The attention of the Committee has been further directed to the danger of important divergencies with regard to matters of doctrine, as well as forms of worship, being introduced amongst the Anglican Churches by the possible assumption on the part of each Province or Diocese of the power of revising the Book of Common Prayer. Such divergencies might be injurious to the Church at large, and would certainly interfere with the mutual relations of its different parts.

It is not within the province of the Committee to lay down rules as to the powers of the different branches of the Anglican Communion in this matter, or as to the line of action which they ought to follow. This remark applies with especial emphasis to the Episcopal Church of America, though the Committee cannot abstain from remarking with pleasure that recent changes made in the Book of Common Prayer by that Church have been rather in the direction of nearer approach to the English Book than of further departure from it. But with regard to the branches of the Church within the limits of Her Majesty's dominions, the Committee cannot express too strongly the opinion which they entertain with regard to the danger of alteration in existing services. They do not deny in general that the Book of Common Prayer may be susceptible of improvement; this susceptibility may probably be predicated of all things human; though it must be remembered that it might be hard to find many improvements, which would be generally and heartily accepted as such. Neither do they wish to express an opinion unfavourable to efforts made to supplement the prayers and services of the Church by others which her needs demand. But the point which the Committee would chiefly urge is this—that the Book of Common Prayer is not the possession of one Diocese or Province, but of all; that a revision in one portion of the Anglican Communion must, therefore, be extensively felt, and that it is not just that any particular portion should undertake revision without consultation with other portions, and especially with the Church at home.

VI. There appears to be a notion current that Clergymen ordained for work in England, who go out to labour for a time in the Colonies, are regarded as more or less disqualified for subsequent preferment at home. The Committee regret that such a notion should be current, and they are of opinion that Clergymen who have been willing to give a portion of the best time of their lives to colonial work may be regarded as having special claims for consideration on their return home. The Committee are aware that the subject is not free from difficulties, and that it is impossible to lay down any general rule; but they have thought it right to give

it a place in their Report, and that some benefit may arise from the course thus adopted.

These are all the matters which have been brought under the notice of the Committee, or which have been deemed of sufficient importance or of a suitable kind to be brought before the Conference. In concluding their Report the Committee would desire to express their sense of the extent and difficulty of the subject which has been entrusted to them, and of the modest character of their contribution to its treatment. But they believe that the wise and perhaps the only course of dealing with such a subject is not to attempt to lay down rules which shall solve all possible problems, but to discuss practical difficulties as they arise, in dependence upon the Holy Spirit of God, and trusting that He who permits the difficulties will give grace and strength to overcome them.

Signed on behalf of the Committee,

H. CARLISLE,

Chairman.

APPENDIX TO REPORT OF COMMITTEE
No. 8.

Another subject has been brought under the notice of the Committee, concerning which they have felt great doubt as to whether it can be regarded as coming within the terms of their reference. The subject, however, is so important, and the Committee have felt so desirous that it should be fairly brought before the Conference, that they have determined to introduce it in the form of an Appendix to their Report.

The question was raised in the first meeting of the Conference, whether it would not be desirable that some declaration should be made concerning the teaching of the English Church, and of those Churches which are in full communion with her.

There can be little doubt as to the existence of much ignorance and misunderstanding, not only as to what this teaching is, but also as to the ground upon which those Churches stand, and as to their relation to other Churches and Christian Societies. Such ignorance and misunderstanding can scarcely fail to interfere seriously with the results of their teaching.

It is true that the English Church possesses a body of teaching in the Book of Common Prayer, in the Catechism, and in the Thirty-nine Articles, to say nothing of the Book of Homilies. But these repositories of teaching, precious as they are, do not appear to the Committee to possess the qualities which ought to belong to a declaration, such as is contemplated in the remarks now made. What is wanted is a plain and brief summary of the definite doctrinal grounds upon which the Anglican Churches stand (somewhat, perhaps, after the manner of the earlier of the Thirty-nine Articles), together with a statement of their relation to other Churches and Christian Societies, and, perhaps, of other cognate matters upon which, on consideration of the whole subject, it might be considered desirable that some distinct utterance should be made. The summary should be such as the whole body of English-speaking Bishops could adopt; it should, therefore, be free from all questions of doubtful controversy; it should be a document which could be freely circulated as a manifesto of the Anglican Churches concerning their status and their teaching.

The proposal, undoubtedly, has its difficulties, as almost every important proposal has; but we think that the difficulties might possibly be overcome; and certainly all danger of mischief would be avoided, if the following plan were adopted:—

It is respectfully suggested:

(1) That a small Committee of English Bishops be appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury for the purpose of drafting such a declaration.

(2) That the Committee have power to consult, if they think fit, with any of their episcopal brethren, and also with eminent divines outside the episcopal body.

(3) That the draft declaration, having been provisionally settled by the Committee, be submitted to the Archbishop of Canterbury, with the request that his Grace will forward copies to each Metropolitan for the consideration of the Bishops in his Province, and that he will, in conjunction with the Archbishop of York, bring the declaration before the English Bishops.

[The term Metropolitan includes Primates of Provinces, the Primus of Scotland, and the Presiding Bishop of the Church of America.]

(4) That each Metropolitan be requested to return a copy of the declaration, either approved, or with suggestions of amendment, within twelve months.

(5) That the Archbishop of Canterbury be requested upon the return of the drafts to take such further steps as the circumstances in his judgment shall appear to warrant.

The Committee recommend that the declaration should be in the form of a series of statements or articles; each dealing with a

different subject, and to be expressed in the simplest possible language.

The Committee feel that they would be going beyond their province if they attempted to dictate the subjects upon which statements should be framed; but in order more clearly to indicate the kind of declaration which they think the needs of the time demand, they venture to specify the following subjects which they believe might be profitably introduced:—

I. Of the Catholic Faith.
II. Of the Holy Scriptures.
III. Of the Sacraments.
IV. Of the Forms of Prayer and Liturgy in use in the Anglican Churches.
V. Of the relation of the Anglican Churches to the Church of Rome.
VI. Of the relation of the Anglican Churches to the Churches of the East.
VII. Of the relation of the Anglican Churches to other Christian Churches and Societies.
VIII. Of the relation of the teaching of the Church of Christ to human knowledge.

It is almost unnecessary to state that the Committee do not regard the above list as exhaustive; nor, on the other hand, do they desire to insist upon each and all of the suggested subjects as essential to the completeness of the proposed declaration.

Signed on behalf of the Committee,

H. CARLISLE,

Chairman.

No. 9.—HOME REUNION.

Report of the Committee[1] *Appointed to Consider what steps (if any) can be rightly taken on Behalf of the Anglican Communion towards the Reunion of the Various Bodies into which the Christianity of the English-Speaking Races is Divided.*

THE Committee was appointed to consider "what steps (if any) "can be rightly taken, on behalf of the Anglican Communion, "towards the Reunion of the various bodies into which the "Christianity of the English-speaking races is divided."

I. On entering upon their duty they had at once brought to their notice evidence of a strong *consensus* of authoritative opinion, from various branches of the Anglican Communion, that the time for some action in this matter, under prayer for God's guidance through many acknowledged difficulties and dangers, has already come; and that the Conference—speaking, as it must speak, with the greatest weight of moral authority—should not separate without some such utterance as may further and direct such action.

In the Convocation of Canterbury the subject has been under discussion, at intervals, for nearly thirty years. In the year 1861 a resolution, on the motion of the Rev. Chancellor Massingberd, was carried *nem. con.* in the Lower House, praying the Bishops to commend the subject of "the Reunion of the divided members of Christ's Body" to the prayers of the faithful.

In 1870, at the instance of the Lower House, a Committee was appointed on Reunion, with power to confer with any similar Committee which might be appointed in the Northern Province. The Committee, in its Report, recommended the use of the special Prayer for Unity, appointed for the day of the Queen's Accession, and the consideration of the propriety of communication on the subject with the chief Nonconformist bodies; and these recom-

[1] Names of the Members of the Committee:—

Bishop of Sydney (*Chairman*).
" Adelaide.
" Antigua (Coadjutor).
" Brechin.
" Edinburgh.
" Hereford.
" Jamaica.
" Lichfield.
" Manchester.
Bishop of Minnesota.
" Nelson.
" New York.
" Ripon.
" Rochester.
" Rupertsland.
" St. Andrew's.
" Wakefield.

mendations, after a singularly interesting debate, were adopted by the House.

The Report contained the following passage:—"The Committee "do not recommend that we should set out with proposing altera- "tions of our existing formularies of faith and worship, while they "by no means deny that concessions might be admitted hereafter, "as the consequence of negotiations carried on in a spirit of love "and unity." It also suggested that on the day of the Queen's Accession "all classes of Nonconformists should be invited to institute similar prayers" for unity, and that the subject might be brought by Sermons before our own people.

In 1887 the subject was again taken up, and a Resolution carried, on the motion of Canon Medd, that "His Grace the President be "requested to direct the appointment of a Joint Committee to "consider, and from time to time to report upon, the relations "between the Church and those who in this country are alienated "from her Communion; and generally to make suggestions as to "means which might tend, by God's blessing, to the furtherance "of union of all among our countrymen who hold the essentials "of the Christian faith." In the speech of the mover of the resolution special reference was made to the probability of the discussion of the subject at the Lambeth Conference.

In the Convocation of York, the Committee have reason to know that similar action has been taken; but, under pressure of time, they have been unable to obtain detailed information of the actual proceedings.

From various Synods of the Colonial Church similar, and even stronger, expressions of a desire to make some movement on the part of the Anglican Communion in this direction have been brought before the Committee. The General Synod of the Church in Australia and Tasmania, in 1886, "desired to place on record "its solemn sense of the evils of the unhappy divisions among "professing Christians, and, through His Grace the Archbishop "of Canterbury, respectfully prayed the Conference of Bishops "to be assembled at Lambeth in 1888 to consider in what manner "steps should be taken to promote greater visible unity among "those who hold the same Creed." A Resolution was passed in almost the same words by the Diocesan Synod of Montreal; and similar Resolutions by the Provincial Synod of Rupertsland, and the General Synod of New Zealand. At the Session of the Provincial Synod of Canada in 1886, a Joint Committee was appointed, to confer with any similar Committees, which might be appointed by other Religious Bodies, on the terms upon which some honourable union might be arrived at.

But the most important and practical step has been taken by our brethren of the American Church in the General Convention of 1886, in accordance with the prayer of a petition signed by more

than a thousand Clergy, including thirty-two Bishops. At that Convention a Committee of the House of Bishops presented a remarkable Report, which, after stating emphatically that the Church did "not seek to absorb other Communions, but to "co-operate with them on the basis of a common Faith and Order, "to discountenance schism, and to heal the wounds of the Body of "Christ"; and that she was prepared to make all reasonable concessions on "all things of human ordering and of human choice," dwelt upon the duty of the Church to preserve, "as inherent parts "of the sacred deposit of Christian faith and order committed by "Christ and His Apostles to the Church, and as therefore essential "to the restoration of unity," the following:—

"1. The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, as the Revealed Word of God.

"2. The Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian Faith.

"3. The two Sacraments—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord —ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution, and the elements ordained by Him.

"4. The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the Unity of His Church."

The Report concluded with the following words:—

"Furthermore, deeply grieved by the sad divisions which afflict the Christian Church in our own land, we hereby declare our desire and readiness, so soon as there shall be any authorised response to this Declaration, to enter into brotherly conference with all or any Christian bodies seeking the restoration of organic Unity of the Church, with a view to the earnest study of the conditions, under which so priceless a blessing might happily be brought to pass."

This Report was adopted by the House of Bishops, and communicated to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies; and, at the instance of the latter House, it was resolved:—

"That a Commission consisting of five Bishops, five Clerical and "five Lay Deputies, be appointed, who shall at their discretion "communicate, to the organised Christian Bodies of our country, "the Declaration set forth by the Bishops on the twentieth day of "October; and shall hold themselves ready to enter into brotherly "conference with all or any Christian Bodies seeking the restora- "tion of the organic unity of the Church."

After consideration of these significant documents, and of memorials from certain Associations which have already done good service in this cause, it was decided by the Committee that they were more than justified in recommending to the Conference that some steps should be taken by it in the direction specified in the Resolution constituting the Committee.

II. In considering how this could best be done, it appeared to the Committee that the subject divided itself naturally into two parts; first, the basis on which the united Church might, in the future, safely rest; secondly, the conditions under which present negotiations for reunion, in view of existing circumstances, could be carried on.

The Committee with deep regret felt that, under present conditions, it was useless to consider the question of Reunion with our brethren of the Roman Church, being painfully aware that any proposal for reunion would be entertained by the authorities of that Church only on condition of a complete submission on our part to those claims of absolute authority, and the acceptance of those other errors, both in doctrine and in discipline, against which, in faithfulness to God's Holy Word, and to the true principles of His Church, we have been for three centuries bound to protest.

But, in regard to the first portion of the subject, the Committee were of opinion that with the chief of the Non-conforming Communions there would not only be less difficulty than is commonly supposed as to the basis of a common faith in the essentials of Christian doctrine, but that, even in respect of Church Government, many of the causes which had originally led to secession had been removed, and that both from deeper study and from larger historical experience, there was in the present day a greater disposition to value and to accept the ancient Church Order. It did not, indeed, appear to them that the question before them, which was of the duty, if any, of the Anglican Communion in this matter, was to be absolutely determined by these considerations; but they seemed, nevertheless, to give important encouragement to the Church in the endeavour to do what might appear to be her duty in furthering this all-important matter.

Accordingly, after careful consideration, they determined to take as the basis of their deliberations on this part of the subject the chief articles embodied in the Report of the Committee of the House of Bishops in the American Church; and after discussion of each, they submit them to the wisdom of the Conference, with some modifications, as supplying the basis on which approach might be, under God's blessing, made towards Reunion:—

1. The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as "containing all things necessary to salvation," and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith.

2. The Apostles' Creed, as the Baptismal Symbol; and the Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith.

3. The two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution, and of the elements ordained by Him.

4. The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of

its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the Unity of His Church.

The Committee believe that upon some such basis as this, with large freedom of variation on secondary points of doctrine, worship, and discipline, and without interference with existing conditions of property and endowment, it might be possible, under God's gracious providence, for a reunited Church, including at least the chief of the Christian Communions of our people, to rest.

III. But they are aware that the main difficulty of the subject lies in the consideration of what practical steps can be taken towards such reunion under the actual religious conditions of the community at home and abroad—complicated, moreover, in England and Scotland by legal difficulties. It appears to them, moreover, clear that on this subject the Conference can only express an opinion on general principles, and that definite action must be left to the constituted authorities in each branch of our Communion, acting, as far as possible, in concert.

They therefore respectfully submit to the Conference the following Resolution:—

"That the constituted authorities of the various branches of our "Communion, acting, so far as may be, in concert with "one another, be earnestly requested to make it known "that they hold themselves in readiness to enter into "brotherly conference (such as that which has already "been proposed by the Church in the United States of "America) with the representatives of other chief Christian Communions in the English-speaking races, in "order to consider what steps can be taken, either "towards corporate reunion, or towards such relations as "may prepare the way for fuller organic unity hereafter."

IV. They cannot conclude their report without laying before the Conference the following suggestion, unanimously adopted by the Committee:—

"That the Conference recommend as of great importance, in "tending to bring about Reunion, the dissemination of "information respecting the standards of doctrine and "the formularies in use in the Anglican Church; and that "information be disseminated, on the other hand, "respecting the authoritative standards of doctrine, worship, and government adopted by the other bodies of "Christians into which the English-speaking races are "divided."

They also desire—following in this respect the example of the Convocation of Canterbury—to pray the Conference to commend

this matter of Reunion to the special prayers of all Christian people, both within and (so far as it may rightly do so) without our Communion, in preparation for the Conferences which have been suggested, and while such Conferences are going on; and they trust that the present Lambeth Conference may also see fit to issue, or to pray His Grace the President to issue, some pastoral letter to all Christian people, upon this all-important subject. For never certainly did the Church of Christ need more urgently the spirit of wisdom and of love, which He alone can bestow, who is "the Author and Giver of all good things."

Signed on behalf of the Committee,

ALFRED SYDNEY,

Chairman.

No. 10.—SCANDINAVIANS—OLD CATHOLICS.

Report of the Committee[1] *Appointed to Consider the Relation of the Anglican Communion* (a) *to the Scandinavian and other Reformed Churches,* (b) *to the Old Catholics and other Reforming Bodies.*

A.

Your Committee consider that, in view of the increasing number of Swedes and other Scandinavians now living in America and in the English Colonies, as well as for the furtherance of Christian Unity, earnest efforts should be made to establish more friendly relations between the Scandinavian and Anglican Churches.

In regard to the Swedish Church your Committee are of opinion that, as its standards of doctrine are to a great extent in accord with our own and its continuity as a national Church has never been

[1] Names of the Members of the Committee:—

Bishop of Winchester (*Chairman*).
Archbishop of Dublin.
Bishop of Albany.
" Cashel.
" Central Africa.
" Cork.
" Derry.
" Dunedin.
Bishop of Gibraltar.
" Iowa.
" Lichfield.
" Lincoln.
" North Carolina.
" Salisbury.
" Western New York.

broken, any approaches on its part should be most gladly welcomed with a view to mutual explanation of differences, and the ultimate establishment, if possible, of permanent intercommunion on sound principles of Ecclesiastical polity.

Greater difficulties are presented as regards communion with the Norwegian and Danish Churches by the constitution of their ministry; but there are grounds of hope, in the growing appreciation of Church order, that in the course of time these difficulties may be surmounted. It is much to be desired that a basis of union should be formed with a people who are distinguished by great devotional earnestness and uprightness of character.

B.

By the name Old Catholics we understand, in general terms, those members of foreign Churches who have been excommunicated on account of their refusal, for conscience' sake, to accept the novel doctrines promulgated by the authority of the Church of Rome, and who yet desire to maintain in its integrity the Catholic Faith, and to remain in full communion with the Catholic Church. As in the previous Conference, held in 1878,[1] we declare that "all sympathy is due from the Anglican Church to the Churches "and individuals protesting against these errors"; and "to those "who are drawn to us in the endeavour to free themselves from "the yoke of error and superstition we are ready to offer all help "and such privileges as may be acceptable to them and are consis-"tent with the maintenance of our own principles, as enunciated in "our formularies."

Ten years have passed since this declaration was issued, and we are now called to consider more in detail our relations to the different groups comprehended under this general title.

I.

First of all it is due to the ancient Church of Holland, which in practice accepts the title of Old Catholic, to recognise the fact that it has uttered energetic protests against the novel dogmas of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and of the universal Bishopric and infallibility of the Bishop of Rome. It is to this Church that the community, usually termed Old Catholic, in the German Empire, owes in the providence of God the Episcopal succession. We recognise, with thankfulness, the dignified and independent position which the Church of Holland maintained for many years in almost absolute isolation. It has

[1] See above, p. 94.

now broken through this isolation, as regards its neighbours on the Continent. As regards ourselves, the Church of Holland is found on inquiry to be in agreement with our Church in many points, and we believe that with more frequent brotherly intercourse many of the barriers which at present separate us might be removed.

II.

The Old Catholic community in Germany differs from the Church of Holland, in this respect, amongst others, that it does not retain possession of the ancient Sees. The Bishop of that community has wisely refrained from assuming a territorial title; we are not, however, without hope that the Old Catholic body may be, with the divine guidance and in God's good time, instrumental in restoring to that country the blessing of a united national Church. It may be noted that Bishop Reinkens, shortly after his consecration, was recognised as a Catholic Bishop by the civil power in Prussia, Baden, and Hesse.[1] He and the parochial Clergy under him have the right and duty, recognised by the State, of teaching the children of their own confession in the public schools. They are also in undisturbed possession of a number of ancient churches and benefices, and receive for the present a subsidy granted by Parliament. .

As regards the form of doctrine actually professed by this body, we believe that its return to the standards of the undivided Church is a distinct advance towards the reunion of Christendom. We learn that it formulates the fuller expression of its belief in catechisms and manuals of instruction, rather than in articles or confessions, because it desires to avoid any methods which might create or perpetuate divisions.

We cannot consider that it is in schism as regards the Roman Church, because to do so would be to concede the lawfulness of the imposition of new terms of communion, and of the extravagant assertions by the Papacy of ordinary and immediate jurisdiction in every Diocese. For ourselves we regard it as a duty to promote friendly relations with the Old Catholics of Germany, not only out of sympathy with them, but also in thankfulness to God, who has strengthened them to suffer for the truth under great discouragements, difficulties, and temptations. We owe them our intercessions, our support, and our brotherly counsel; and we have reason to believe that aid from individual members of our Church

[1] The documents in question are printed at length in "Der Altkatholikismus," published in 1887 by J. F. von Schulte, pp. 405, 415, 416. The Prussian Old Catholic law is to be found on pp. 44–46. Cp. pp. 549 foll. (Staatszuschuss für die Altkatholiken).

may be most beneficially given towards the training of their future Clergy.

We see no reason why we should not admit their Clergy and faithful Laity to Holy Communion on the same conditions as our own Communicants, and we also acknowledge the readiness which they have shown to offer spiritual privileges to members of our own Church.

We regret that differences in our marriage laws, which we believe to be of great importance, compel us to state that we are obliged to debar from Holy Communion any person who may have contracted a marriage not sanctioned by the laws and canons of the Anglican Church. Nor could we, in justice to the Old Catholics, admit anyone who would be debarred from communion among themselves.

III.

The "Christian Catholic Church" in Switzerland, which has adopted a title long used by the Church in that country, has a recognised civil position of much the same character as that possessed by the Old Catholics of Germany. We consider that it is a body now sufficiently established to receive the assurance of the same sympathy and the offer of the same privileges from ourselves.

IV.

The Old Catholic community in Austria has been recognised by the State as a distinct religious association, in accordance with the law of May 20th, 1874.[1] Its constitution provides for the presidency of a Bishop, but no election has as yet taken place, not from any indifference on the part of its members, but on account of the difficulty of securing the stipend required by law. In the meantime, it has many of the rights secured by law to the German body. The Austrian Old Catholics have made great sacrifices, and deserve great sympathy from us; which we hope may be expressed in a practical manner. They have, we believe, an important future before them, if rightly guided. We cannot, however, regard the organisation in Austria as sufficiently tried and complete to warrant a more formal relation on our part at the present time.

V.

The same remark applies with even greater force to the smaller groups of brave and earnest men of the Latin races, driven under somewhat similar circumstances to associate themselves in separate

[1] Von Schulte, "Der Altkatholikismus," p. 435.

congregations in Italy, France, Spain and Portugal. We sympathise with their efforts to free themselves from the burden of unlawful terms of communion. We have reason to believe that there are many who think with them, but have not seen the way to follow the outward steps which they have taken. We trust that in time they may be enabled to adopt such sound forms of doctrine and discipline and to secure such Catholic organisation as will permit us to give them a fuller recognition. We desire, in our outlook into the future, to call to mind the well-known declaration of the Gallican Clergy of 1862,[1] and also the advances made by Archbishop Wake in correspondence with the Doctors of the Sorbonne,[2] towards establishing a basis for intercommunion between the Churches of France and England. If some such principles could now be revived, we have reason to believe that they would be welcomed by many both in France and Italy, and they might again form the basis for hopeful negotiations.

In concluding this portion of our Report we feel it our duty to express the opinion that the consecration, by Bishops of our Communion, of a Bishop, to exercise his functions in a foreign country, within the limits of an ancient territorial jurisdiction and over the natives of that country, is a step of the gravest importance and fraught with enduring consequences, the issues of which cannot be foreseen. Whilst the right of Bishops of the Catholic Church to interpose under conditions of extreme necessity has always been

[1] See Bossuet's "Défense de la Declaration du Clergé de France, etc." 2 vols., 4to, Amsterdam 1745, and Dupin's "Manuel du Droit public ecclésiastique français," pp. 97–100, ed. 5, Paris, Henri Plon, 1860.

[2] Archbishop Wake wrote as follows to Mr. Beauvoir, on November 18th, 1718, in regard to this correspondence :—"If we could once divide the Gallican Church [from the Roman], a reformation in other matters would follow as a matter of course. The scheme that seems to me most likely to prevail, is, to agree in the independence (as to all matters of authority) of every national Church on any others; and in their right to determine all matters that arise within themselves; and, for points of doctrine, to agree, as far as possible, in all articles of any moment (as in effect we already do, or easily may); and, for other matters, to allow a difference till God shall bring us to a union in those also. One only thing should be provided for, to purge out of the public offices of the Church such things as hinder a perfect communion in the service of the Church, that so, wherever any come from us to them or from them to us, we may all join together in Prayers and the Holy Sacraments with each other. In our Liturgy there is nothing but what they allow, save the single rubric relating to the Eucharist; in theirs nothing but what they agree may be laid aside, and yet the public offices be never the worse or more imperfect for the want of it. Such a scheme as this I take to be a more proper ground of peace at the beginning than to go to more particulars."

The correspondence of Archbishop Wake with Mr. Beauvoir, Dr. Dupin, Dr. P. Piers Girardin, and others, is printed in the fourth Appendix to Dr. Maclaine's translation of Mosheim's "Church History," vol. vi., pp. 126, foll., London, 1828. The above letter will be found in full on p. 172, and is quoted in Rev. G. G. Perry's "History of the English Church, third period," p. 48, London, 1887.

acknowledged, we deprecate any action that does not carefully regard primitive and established principles of jurisdiction and the interests of the whole Anglican Communion.

VI.

Lastly, the Committee have been asked at the last moment to consider the subject of the orders of the United Brethren, commonly called the Moravians. At the last Conference a number of the Bishops "were recommended to associate with themselves such "learned persons as they might deem eminently qualified to assist "them by their knowledge of the historical difficulties involved." [1] These Bishops have not been able to act upon this recommendation, and no report is before the Conference. Your Committee, in the short time allowed them, have not found it possible to inquire into the details of this subject with such care as would enable them to propose to the Conference any sufficient basis for the expression of an authoritative opinion.

It must not, however, be overlooked that from time to time, up to the present day, very friendly relations have existed between Moravians and members of our Communion. In their greatest trials they have received from eminent English Bishops and Churchmen the sympathy and support due to a zealous body of Christians, imbued with a primitive spirit, and claiming to possess a valid Episcopate.

The labours of Moravian Missionaries are known to all the world. We should therefore welcome any clearer illustration of their history and actual status on the part of their own divines.

The subjects committed to the consideration of this Committee have embraced, as will be seen, a very wide range of interests, and we have reluctantly been compelled, on this account, to confine our Report almost entirely to the bodies specified in the terms of our commission.

Signed on behalf of the Committee,

E. Harold Winton:

Chairman.

[1] See above, p. 95.

No. 11.—EASTERN CHURCHES.

Report of the Committee[1] *Appointed to Consider the Relation of the Anglican Communion to the Eastern Churches.*

Your Committee regard the friendly feelings manifested towards our Church by the Orthodox Eastern Communion as a matter for deep thankfulness. These feelings inspire the hope that at no distant time closer relations may be established between the two Churches. Your Committee, however, are of opinion that any hasty or ill-considered step in this direction would only retard the accomplishment of this hope. Our expectations of nearer fellowship are founded upon the friendly tone of the correspondence which the Archbishop of Canterbury and his predecessors have held from time to time with Patriarchs of the Orthodox Church, and upon the cordiality of the welcome given by the Heads of that Church to Anglican Bishops and Clergy, such as the Bishop of Gibraltar, who have travelled in the East. Additional grounds of hope are furnished by the visit of Archbishop[2] Lycurgus to England in 1870, by the conversation which passed between him and the present Bishop of Winchester at Ely, by the words which Archbishop Lycurgus used at the conclusion of the second Conference held at Bonn[3]; and by the request which the Orthodox Patriarch of Jerusalem recently addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury, that the Anglican Bishopric in Jerusalem should be reconstituted, and that the headquarters of the Bishop should be placed in that city rather than at Beyrout or elsewhere.

[1] Names of the Members of the Committee:—

Bishop of Winchester (*Chairman*).	Bishop of Limerick.
Bishop Blyth.	,, Meath.
Bishop of Gibraltar.	,, Springfield.
,, Iowa.	,, Travancore.

[2] Lycurgus, late Archbishop of Syra and Tenos.

[3] At the end of the Conference at Ely (1870), Archbishop Lycurgus said,

"When I return to Greece I will say that the Church of England is not like other Protestant bodies. I will say that it is a sound Catholic Church very like our own; and I trust that by friendly discussion union between the two Churches may be brought about."

At the end of the Bonn Conference (1875), he said to Dr. von Döllinger,

"In the name of all those of my own communion I thank you, Mr. President, for your marvellous efforts in the work of reuniting the several Churches, of bring together again the so numerous divisions of the Rock of our Redeemer. Our joy is full; and there will be great joy in our homes also. We earnestly pray God for His further blessing."

We reflect with thankfulness that there exist no bars, such as are presented to communion with the Latins by the formulated assertion of the infallibility of the Church residing in the person of the Supreme Pontiff, by the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, and other novel dogmas imposed by the decrees of later Councils.

We must congratulate the Christian world that, through the research of a Greek Metropolitan, literature has been lately enriched by the recovery of an ancient document which throws unexpected light upon the early development of ecclesiastical organisation.

It would not be right, however, to disguise from ourselves the hindrances which exist on either side. The first and most formidable of these is the disputed clause inserted in the Creed of Constantinople, erroneously called the Nicene Creed, without any Conciliar authority, by the Latin Church. This clause, which has the prescription of centuries, and is capable of being explained in an orthodox sense, it may be very difficult to remove. Another barrier to full understanding between the Orthodox Eastern Church and ourselves would be the extreme importance attached by that Church to trine immersion in the rite of Baptism, which practice, however, there is nothing to prevent our Church from formally sanctioning. We, on the other hand, experience a somewhat similar difficulty as regards the Eastern rite of Confirmation, which we can hardly consider equivalent to ours, inasmuch as it omits the imposition of the Bishop's hands, and is usually conferred upon unconscious infants; yet we do not regard this as requiring members of the Orthodox Church to receive our Confirmation. It would be difficult for us to enter into more intimate relations with that Church so long as it retains the use of icons, the invocation of the Saints, and the cultus of the Blessed Virgin; although it is but fair to state that the Greeks, in sanctioning the use of pictorial representations for the purpose of promoting devotion, expressly disclaim the sin of idolatry, which they conceive would attach to the bowing down before sculptured or molten images. Moreover, the decrees of the second Council of Nicæa, sanctioning the use of icons, were framed in a spirit of reaction against the rationalising measures, as they were regarded, of the iconoclastic Emperors. The Greeks might be reminded that the decrees of that Council, having been deliberately rejected seven years afterwards by the Council of Frankfort, and not having been accepted by the Latin Church till after the lapse of two centuries, and then only under Papal influence, cannot be regarded as binding upon the Church.

Your Committee would impress upon their fellow-Christians the propriety of abstaining from all efforts to induce individual members of the Orthodox Eastern Church to leave their own

communion. If some be dissatisfied with its teaching or usages, and find a lack of spiritual life in its worship, they should be advised not to leave the Church of their baptism, but by remaining in it to endeavour to become centres of life and light to their own people; more especially as the Orthodox Eastern Church has never committed itself to any theory that would make it impossible to reconsider and revise its standards and practice.

Your Committee think it desirable that the Heads of that communion should be supplied with some authoritative document setting forth the historical facts relating to our orders and our position in the Catholic Church; as much misconception appears still to prevail on this subject. Your Committee feel that the position which England now occupies in Cyprus and in Egypt places in our hands exceptional opportunities of elevating the moral and spiritual life of our Eastern brethren. Especially may this be done by introducing or promoting higher education: any help given in this way we have reason to believe would be warmly welcomed. We rejoice to know that schools have lately been established at Constantinople and elsewhere for the purpose of supplying education to those who are in training for the ministry. In the more general diffusion of knowledge amongst the instructors of the people lies the best hope of that mutual understanding and esteem for which the Heads of the Orthodox Church have shown so much desire.

Your Committee cannot be expected to deal separately with the other Churches of the East, among which the Armenian appears to be the largest and most important. Approaches have been made to us from time to time by Bishops and other representatives of this communion, appealing for aid in support of educational projects for the instruction of their own people. The Armenian Church lies under the imputation of heresy. But it has always protested against this imputation, affirming the charge to have arisen from a misconception of its formularies. The departure from orthodoxy may, perhaps, have been more apparent than real; and the erroneous element in its creed appears now to be gradually losing its hold upon the moral and religious consciousness of the Armenian people.

In regard to other Eastern communities, such as the Coptic, Abyssinian, Syrian, and Chaldean, your Committee consider that our position in the East involves some obligations. And if these communities have fallen into error, and show a lack of moral and spiritual life, we must recollect that but for them the light of Christianity in these countries would have been utterly extinguished, and that they have suffered for many centuries from cruel oppression and persecution. If we should have opportunity, our aim should be to improve their mental, moral, and religious condition, and to induce them to return to the unity of the faith

without prejudice to their liberty. This we take to be the purpose of the Assyrian Mission set on foot by the late Archbishop of Canterbury, and continued by his successor.

In conclusion, we would call attention to the fact that in the East advance is slow, and even in the West we find differences perpetuate themselves, owing to national peculiarities, hereditary prejudices, and other causes, in spite of real wish for unity. We think that Christians need to be cautioned against impatience in expecting quick results. Such impatience argues imperfect trust in the ultimate fulfilment of our Lord's prayer for His people that they "all may be ONE."

Signed on behalf of the Committee,

E. HAROLD WINTON:

Chairman.

No. 12.—AUTHORITATIVE STANDARDS.

Report of the Committee[1] *Appointed to Consider the Subject of Authoritative Standards of Doctrine and Worship.*

In considering the subject of the Authoritative Standards of Doctrine and Worship, which are the primary means of securing internal union amongst ourselves, and of setting forth our Faith before the rest of Christendom, we acknowledge first of all with deep thankfulness to Almighty God the vital and growing unity of the great Communion to which we belong.

We acknowledge also with the same heartfelt thankfulness the increasing intercourse which is taking place between our own Churches and other Churches of Christendom, and the extension

[1] Names of the Members of the Committee:—

Bishop of Ely (*Chairman*).
" Aberdeen.
" Albany.
" Arkansas.
" Derry.
" Dover.
" Edinburgh.
" Grahamstown.
Bishop in Japan.
Bishop of Meath.
" Nassau.
" Qu'Appelle.
" Rupertsland.
" Salisbury.
" St. David's.
" Sydney.
" Western New York.

of our own Communion into many non-Christian countries, to which God has especially called us to minister by the diffusion of the English-speaking race throughout the world.

The consideration of the new conditions thus created seems to call for a careful statement of our own position in regard to authoritative standards of doctrine and worship.

This statement is divided into three parts:—first, as to standards of doctrine and worship which unite us with the great Body of the Church Universal; second, as to those which regulate our internal union or should be imposed upon Missionary Churches; third, as to a manual of doctrine for general use, but which should not be authoritative.

I.

We recognise before all things, and amidst all discouragements and divisions, the great bond of an essential unity which exists amongst all Christians who own the one Lord Jesus Christ as their Head and King, who accept the paramount authority of Holy Scripture, who confess the doctrine of the Nicene Faith, and who acknowledge one Baptism into the Name of the Blessed Trinity.

But we cannot regard this measure of unity as adequately fulfilling our Lord's prayer that His followers should be one, and we feel, therefore, that it is our duty to explain our own principles as regards standards of doctrine and worship, in the humble hope of preparing the way, so far as in us lies, for the reunion of Christendom.

We have a duty to the Church Universal; we have a duty also towards those who are now distinctly within our own Communion or who may hereafter be so closely allied to it as to form practically one body with ourselves.

As in former Conferences,[1] we declare that we continue "united under one divine Head in the fellowship of the one Catholic and Apostolic Church, holding the one faith revealed in Holy Writ, defined in the Creeds, maintained by the primitive Church," and "affirmed by the undisputed" Œcumenical "Councils."

In defining our own position more explicitly we recognise, with the general consent of the Fathers, that the canonical books of the Old and New Testament "contain all things necessary to salvation," and are the rule and ultimate standard of all Christian doctrine.

In addition to the Creed commonly called the Nicene Creed, to which we have already referred, we, as a part of the Western Church, have a common inheritance in the "Apostles' Creed,"

[1] See above pp. 53 and 83.

confessed by us all in the Sacrament of Baptism. In like manner we accept the hymn *Quicunque vult*, whether or not recited in the public worship of our Churches, as resting upon certain warrant of Scripture, and as most useful, both at home and in our missions, in ascertaining and defining the fundamental mysteries of the Holy Trinity, and of the Incarnation of our Blessed Lord; and thus guarding believers from lapsing into heresy.

In relation to the doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit, while we believe that there is no fundamental diversity of faith between the Churches of the East and West,[1] we recognise the historical fact that the clause *Filioque* makes no part of the Nicene Symbol as set forth by the authority of the undivided Church.

We are of opinion that, as opportunity arises, it would be well to revise the English version of the Nicene Creed and of the *Quicunque vult.*

We suggest to the Conference that the President be requested to appoint a Committee for this purpose.

With regard to the authority of the Œcumenical Councils, our Communion has always recognised the decisions of the first four Councils on matters of faith, nor is there any point of dogma in which it disagrees with the teaching of the fifth and sixth.

The second Council of Nicæa commonly called the seventh Council is, however, not undisputed, and while we recognise the historical circumstances of the eighth century, which naturally led to the strong protest against iconoclasm made there, it is our duty to assert that our Church has never accepted the teaching of that Council in reference to the veneration of sacred pictures.

II.

From the standards of doctrine of the Universal Church which the whole Anglican Communion has always accepted,[2] we now

[1] The Committee beg to refer, in illustration of this statement, to the important propositions, accepted by Members both of the Eastern and Western Churches, which were agreed to at the Reunion Conference held at Bonn, August 16th, 1875, under the Presidency of Dr. J. J. I. von Döllinger. See the "Report of the Proceedings, etc.," with a Preface by Dr. Liddon. Pickering, London, 1876, pp. 103, 104.

[2] "Let Preachers take care that they never teach anything in a sermon which they wish to be religiously held and believed by the people, except what is in accord with the doctrine of the Old or New Testament, and what the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops have collected from the same doctrine."—"Canon of 1571, concerning Preachers."

"Such person, etc. . . . shall not in anywise have authority or power to order, determine or adjudge any matter or cause to be heresie, but onely such as heretofore have been determined, ordered or adjudged to be heresie, by the authority of the Canonical Scriptures or by the first four general Councils or any of them, or by any other general Council

pass to those standards of doctrine and worship which are specially the heritage of the Church of England, and which are, to a greater or less extent, received by all her sister and daughter Churches. These are the Prayer Book with its Catechism, the Ordinal, and the XXXIX. Articles of Religion.

All these are subscribed by our clergy at ordination or admission to office, but the XXXIX. Articles are not imposed upon any person as a condition of communion. With respect to the Prayer Book and Articles, we do not consider it an indispensable condition of intercommunion that they should be everywhere accepted in their original form, or that the interpretation put upon them by local courts or provincial tribunals should be received by every branch or province of the Anglican Communion. In illustration of this principle, we would refer to the differences from the English Order of the Administration of the Holy Communion which have long existed in the Scottish and American Churches, and to the facts that the XXXIX. Articles of Religion were only accepted in America in the year 1801 with some variations, and in Scotland in 1804, and that the Church of Ireland as well as the Church in America, has introduced some modifications into the Book of Common Prayer.

We, however, strongly deprecate any further material variation in the text of the existing Sacramental offices of the Church, or of the Ordinal, than is at present recognised among us, unless with the advice of some Conference or Council representing the whole Communion.

With regard to the daily offices and such further forms of service as the exigencies of different Churches or countries may demand, we feel that they may be safely left for the present to the action of the Bishops of each Province. We do not demand a rigid uniformity, but we desire to see the prevalence of a spirit of mutual and sympathetic concession, which will prevent the growth of substantial divergences between different portions of our communion. With regard to those Dioceses which are not yet united into Provinces, we recommend that the Bishop of the Diocese should not act in the way of revision of, or additions to, such offices without the advice of the Archbishop of Canterbury; or in the case of foreign Missionary jurisdictions of the American Church, without the advice of its Presiding Bishop.

With regard to the XXXIX. Articles of Religion we thank God for the wisdom which guided our fathers, in difficult times, in

wherein the same was declared heresie by the express and plain words of the said Canonical Scriptures, or such as hereafter shall be ordered judged or determined to be heresie, by the High Court of Parliament of this realm, with the assent of the Clergy in their Convocation; anything in this Act contained to the contrary notwithstanding."

1 Eliz. 1 § XXXVI.

framing statements of doctrine, for the most part accurate in their language and reserved and moderate in their definitions. Even when speaking most strongly and under the pressure of great provocation, our Communion has generally refrained from anathemas upon opponents, and we desire in this to follow those who have preceded us in the faith. The omission of a few clauses in a few of the Articles would render the whole body free from any imputation of injustice or harshness towards those who differ from us. At the same time we feel that the Articles are not all of equal value, that they are not, and do not profess to be, a complete statement of Christian doctrine, and that, from the temporary and local circumstances under which they were composed, they do not always meet the requirements of Churches founded under wholly different conditions.

Some modification of these Articles may therefore naturally be expected on the part of newly-constituted Churches, and particularly in non-Christian lands. But we consider that it should be a condition of the recognition of such Churches as in complete intercommunion with our own, and especially of their receiving from us our episcopal succession, that we should first receive from them satisfactory evidence that they hold substantially the same type of doctrine with ourselves. More particularly we are of opinion that the Clergy of such Churches should accept articles in accordance with the positive statements of our own standards of doctrine and worship, particularly on the substance and rule of faith, on the state and redemption of man, on the office of the Church, and on the Sacraments and other special ordinances of our holy religion.

III.

In the foregoing resolutions we have confined ourselves to a consideration of existing authoritative formularies, and to such as may serve the like use under particular conditions. We are unable, after careful consideration of the subject, to recommend that any new declaration of doctrine should, at the present time, be put forth by authority. We are, however, of opinion that the time has come when an effort should be made to compose a manual for teachers which should contain a summary of the doctrine of the Church, as generally received among us. Such a manual would draw its statements of doctrine from authoritative documents already existing, but would exhibit them in a completer and more systematic form. It would, also, naturally include some explanation of the Services and ceremonies of the Church. The whole might be preceded by a historical sketch of the position and claims of our Communion.

Such a Manual would, we believe, be of great service both in

maintaining the type of doctrine to which we have referred, and in enabling members of other Churches to form a just opinion of our doctrines and worship. We suggest that His Grace the President be requested to nominate three or more Bishops to undertake such a work, and, if it seem good to him and to the other Archbishops, Metropolitans, and Presiding Bishops of the Church, that they give the work, when completed, the sanction of their imprimatur. We do not suggest that the Conference should be asked to undertake this work, or that it should be regarded as an authoritative standard of the Church.

Signed on behalf of the Committee,

ALWYNE ELY.

Chairman.

XI.

1897.

LIST OF THE BISHOPS ATTENDING THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE OF 1897, ARRANGED ACCORDING TO PROVINCES. (See p. 42.)

[*N.B.—By action taken during the Conference the Bishop of Capetown, the Bishop of Jamaica, and the Bishop of Sydney, became respectively Archbishop of Capetown, Archbishop of the West Indies, and Archbishop of Sydney.*]

Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Rev. F. Temple, D.D.).
Bishop of Dover (Rt. Rev. G. R. Eden, D.D.).
Bishop of London (Rt. Rev. M. Creighton, D.D.).
Bishop of Marlborough (Rt. Rev. A. Earle, D.D.).
Bishop of Stepney (Rt. Rev. G. F. Browne, D.D.).
Rt. Rev. Bishop T. E. Wilkinson, D.D.
Rt. Rev. Bishop Barry, D.D.
Bishop of Winchester (Rt. Rev. R. T. Davidson, D.D.).
Bishop of Guildford (Rt. Rev. G. H. Sumner, D.D.).
Bishop of Southampton (Rt. Rev. G. C. Fisher, D.D.).
Bishop of Bath and Wells (Rt. Rev. G. W. Kennion, D.D.).
Bishop of Chichester (Rt. Rev. E. R. Wilberforce, D.D.).
Bishop of Ely (Rt. Rev. Lord Alwyne Compton, D.D.).
Rt. Rev. Bishop Macrorie, D.D.
Bishop of Exeter (Rt. Rev. E. H. Bickersteth, D.D.).
Bishop of Crediton (Rt. Rev. R. E. Trefusis, D.D.).
Bishop of Gloucester (Rt. Rev. C. J. Ellicott, D.D.).
Rt. Rev. Bishop Marsden, D.D.
Bishop of Hereford (Rt. Rev. J. Percival, D.D.).
Bishop of Lichfield (Rt. Rev. the Hon. A. Legge, D.D.).
Bishop of Shrewsbury (Rt. Rev. Sir L. T. Stamer, Bt., D.D.).
Bishop of Lincoln (Rt. Rev. E. King, D.D.).
Bishop of Llandaff (Rt. Rev. R. Lewis, D.D.).
Bishop of Norwich (Rt. Rev. J. Sheepshanks, D.D.).
Bishop of Thetford (Rt. Rev. A. T. Lloyd, D.D.).

Bishop of Oxford (Rt. Rev. W. Stubbs, D.D.).
Bishop of Reading (Rt. Rev. J. L. Randall, D.D.).
Bishop of Peterborough (Rt. Rev. the Hon. E. Carr Glyn, D.D.).
Bishop of Leicester (Rt. Rev. F. H. Thicknesse, D.D.).
Rt. Rev. Bishop Mitchinson, D.D.
Bishop of Rochester (Rt. Rev. E. S. Talbot, D.D.).
Bishop of Southwark (Rt. Rev. H. W. Yeatman, D.D.).
Bishop of St. Albans (Rt. Rev. J. W. Festing, D.D.).
Bishop of Colchester (Rt. Rev. H. F. Johnson, D.D.).
Bishop of St. Asaph (Rt. Rev. A. G. Edwards, D.D.).
Bishop of St. David's (Rt. Rev. J. Owen, D.D.).
Bishop of Swansea (Rt. Rev. J. Lloyd, D.D.).
Bishop of Salisbury (Rt. Rev. J. Wordsworth, D.D.).
Bishop of Southwell (Rt. Rev. G. Ridding, D.D.).
Bishop of Derby (Rt. Rev. E. A. Were, D.D.).
Bishop of Truro (Rt. Rev. J. Gott, D.D.).
Bishop of Worcester (Rt. Rev. J. J. S. Perowne, D.D.).
Bishop of Coventry (Rt. Rev. E. A. Knox, D.D.).

Archbishop of York (Most Rev. W. D. Maclagan, D.D.).
Bishop of Beverley (Rt. Rev. R. J. Crosthwaite, D.D.).
Bishop of Hull (Rt. Rev. R. F. L. Blunt, D.D.).
Bishop of Durham (Rt. Rev. B. F. Westcott, D.D.).
Bishop of Carlisle (Rt. Rev. J. W. Bardsley, D.D.).
Bishop of Barrow (Rt. Rev. H. Ware, D.D.).
Bishop of Chester (Rt. Rev. F. J. Jayne, D.D.).
Bishop of Manchester (Rt. Rev. J. Moorhouse, D.D.).
Rt. Rev. Bishop Cramer Roberts, D.D.
Bishop of Newcastle (Rt. Rev. E. Jacob, D.D.).
Bishop of Ripon (Rt. Rev. W. B. Carpenter, D.D.).
Bishop of Richmond (Rt. Rev. J. J. Pulleine, D.D.).
Bishop of Wakefield (Rt. Rev. W. W. How, D.D.).
Bishop of Sodor and Man (Rt. Rev. N. D. J. Straton, D.D.).
Rt. Rev. Bishop Royston, D.D.

Archbishop of Armagh (Most. Rev. W. Alexander, D.D.).
Bishop of Clogher (Rt. Rev. C. M. Stack, D.D.).
Bishop of Derry (Rt. Rev. G. A. Chadwick, D.D.).
Bishop of Down and Connor (Rt. Rev. T. J. Welland, D.D.).
Bishop of Tuam (Rt. Rev. J. O'Sullivan, D.D.).

Archbishop of Dublin (Most Rev. J. F. Peacocke, D.D.).
Bishop of Cashel (Rt. Rev. M. F. Day, D.D.).
Bishop of Cork (Rt. Rev. W. E. Meade, D.D.).
Bishop of Killaloe (Rt. Rev. M. Archdall, D.D.).
Bishop of Limerick (Rt. Rev. C. Graves, D.D.).

Bishop of Brechin (Most Rev. H. W. Jermyn, D.D.), *Primus*.
Bishop of Aberdeen (Rt. Rev. the Hon. A. G. Douglas, D.D.).
Bishop of Argyll and the Isles (Rt. Rev. J. R. A. Chinnery Haldane, D.D.).
Bishop of Edinburgh (Rt. Rev. J. Dowden, D.D.).
Bishop of Glasgow (Rt. Rev. W. T. Harrison, D.D.).
Bishop of Moray and Ross (Rt. Rev. J. B. K. Kelly, D.D.).
Bishop of St. Andrew's (Rt. Rev. G. H. Wilkinson, D.D.).

Bishop of Calcutta (Most Rev. E. R. Johnson, D.D.), *Metropolitan*.
Bishop of Chota Nagpore (Rt. Rev. J. C. Whitley).
Bishop of Colombo (Rt. Rev. R. S. Copleston, D.D.).
Bishop of Lucknow (Rt. Rev. A. Clifford, D.D.).
Bishop of Madras (Rt. Rev. F. Gell, D.D.).
Bishop of Rangoon (Rt. Rev. J. M. Strachan, D.D.).
Bishop of Tinnevelly (Rt. Rev. S. Morley).
Bishop of Travancore and Cochin (Rt. Rev. E. N. Hodges, D.D.).

Archbishop of Ontario (Most Rev. J. T. Lewis, D.D.).
Bishop of Algoma (Rt. Rev. G. Thorneloe, D.D.).
Bishop of Fredericton (Rt. Rev. H. T. Kingdon, D.D.).
Bishop of Huron (Rt. Rev. M. S. Baldwin, D.D.).
Bishop of Niagara (Rt. Rev. J. P. Du Moulin, D.C.L.).
Bishop of Nova Scotia (Rt. Rev. F. Courtney, D.D.).
Bishop of Quebec (Rt. Rev. A. H. Dunn, D.D.).
Bishop of Toronto (Rt. Rev. A. Sweatman, D.D.).

Archbishop of Rupertsland (Most Rev. R. Machray, D.D.).
Bishop of Moosonee (Rt. Rev. J. A. Newnham, D.D.).
Bishop of Qu'Appelle (Rt. Rev. J. Grisdale, D.D.).
Bishop of Saskatchewan (Rt. Rev. W. C. Pinkham, D.D.).

Archbishop of Sydney (Most Rev. W. S. Smith, D.D.).
Bishop of Adelaide (Rt. Rev. J. R. Harmer, D.D.).
Bishop of Ballarat (Rt. Rev. S. Thornton, D.D.).
Bishop of Brisbane (Rt. Rev. W. T. T. Webber, D.D.).
Bishop Coadjutor of Brisbane (Rt. Rev. J. F. Stretch, D.D.).
Bishop of Goulburn (Rt. Rev. W. Chalmers, D.D.).
Bishop of Newcastle, N.S.W. (Rt. Rev. G. H. Stanton, D.D.).
Bishop of North Queensland (Rt. Rev. C. G. Barlow, D.D.).
Bishop of Perth (Rt. Rev. C. O. L. Riley, D.D.).
Bishop of Rockhampton (Rt. Rev. N. Dawes, D.D.).

Bishop of Tasmania (Rt. Rev. H. H. Montgomery, D.D.).
Bishop of Auckland (Most Rev. W. G. Cowie, D.D.), *Metropolitan.*
Bishop of Christchurch (Rt. Rev. C. Julius, D.D.).
Bishop of Dunedin (Rt. Rev. S. T. Nevill, D.D.).
Bishop of Waiapu (Rt. Rev. W. L. Williams, D.D.).
Bishop of Wellington (Rt. Rev. F. Wallis, D.D.).

Archbishop of Capetown (Most Rev. W. W. Jones, D.D.).
Bishop Coadjutor of Capetown (Rt. Rev. A. G. S. Gibson, D.D.).
Bishop of Bloemfontein (Rt. Rev. J. W. Hicks, D.D.).
Bishop of Grahamstown (Rt. Rev. A. B. Webb, D.D.).
Bishop of Lebombo (Rt. Rev. W. E. Smyth).
Bishop of Natal (Rt. Rev. A. H. Baynes, D.D.).
Bishop of Pretoria (Rt. Rev. H. B. Bousfield, D.D.).
Bishop of St. John's, Kaffraria (Rt. Rev. B. L. Key, D.D.).

Archbishop of the West Indies (Most Rev. E. Nuttall, D.D.).
Asst.-Bishop of Jamaica (Rt. Rev. C. F. Douet, D.D.).
Bishop of Antigua (Rt. Rev. H. Mather).
Bishop of Barbados and the Windward Islands (Rt. Rev. H. Bree, D.D.).
Bishop of Guiana (Rt. Rev. W. P. Swaby, D.D.).
Bishop of Honduras (Rt. Rev. G. A. Ormsby, D.D.).
Bishop of Trinidad (Rt. Rev. J. T. Hayes, D.D.).

Bishop of Caledonia (Rt. Rev. W. Ridley, D.D.).
Bishop of Columbia (Rt. Rev. W. W. Perrin, D.D.).
Bishop in Corea (Rt. Rev. C. J. Corfe, D.D.).
Bishop in Eastern Equatorial Africa (Rt. Rev. A. R. Tucker, D.D.).
Bishop of Falkland Islands (Rt. Rev. W. H. Stirling, D.D.).
Bishop of Gibraltar (Rt. Rev. C. W. Sandford, D.D.).
Bishop of Honolulu (Rt. Rev. A. Willis, D.D.).
Bishop in Jerusalem and the East (Rt. Rev. G. F. P. Blyth, D.D.).
Bishop in Kiu Shiu (South Japan) (Rt. Rev. H. Evington, D.D.).
Bishop of Mauritius (Rt. Rev. W. Walsh, D.D.).
Bishop of Newfoundland (Rt. Rev. Ll. Jones, D.D.).
Bishop of New Westminster (Rt. Rev. J. Dart, D.D.).
Bishop of Osaka (Rt. Rev. W. Awdry, D.D.).
Bishop of Sierra Leone (Rt. Rev. J. T. Smith, D.D.).
Bishop in South Tokyo (Rt. Rev. E. Bickersteth, D.D.).
Bishop in Western Equatorial Africa (Rt. Rev. H. Tugwell, D.D.).

Asst.-Bishops in Western Equatorial Africa:—
Rt. Rev. Bishop Oluwole, D.D.
Rt. Rev. Bishop Phillips, D.D.
Bishop of Zanzibar (Rt. Rev. W. M. Richardson, D.D.).

Bishop of Albany (Rt. Rev. W. C. Doane, D.D.).
Bishop of California (Rt. Rev. W. F. Nichols, D.D.).
Bishop of Chicago (Rt. Rev. W. E. McLaren, D.D.).
Bishop of Colorado (Rt. Rev. J. F. Spalding, D.D.).
Bishop of Dallas (Rt. Rev. A. C. Garrett, D.D.).
Bishop of Delaware (Rt. Rev. L. Coleman, D.D.).
Bishop of Duluth (Rt. Rev. J. D. Morrison, D.D.).
Bishop of Fond du Lac (Rt. Rev. C. C. Grafton, S.T.D.).
Bishop of Georgia (Rt. Rev. C. K. Nelson, D.D.).
Bishop of Indiana (Rt. Rev. J. H. White, D.D.).
Bishop of Iowa (Rt. Rev. W. S. Perry, D.D.).
Bishop of Kansas (Rt. Rev. F. R. Millspaugh, D.D.).
Bishop of Kentucky (Rt. Rev. T. U. Dudley, D.D.).
Bishop of Lexington (Rt. Rev. L. W. Burton, D.D.).
Bishop of Los Angeles (Rt. Rev. J. H. Johnson, D.D.).
Bishop of Maine (Rt. Rev. H. A. Neely, D.D.).
Bishop of Marquette (Rt. Rev. G. M. Williams, D.D.).
Bishop of Maryland (Rt. Rev. W. Paret, D.D.).
Bishop of Massachusetts (Rt. Rev. W. Lawrence, D.D.).
Bishop of Michigan (Rt. Rev. T. F. Davies, D.D.).
Bishop of Minnesota (Rt. Rev. H. B. Whipple, D.D.).
Bishop Coadjutor of Minnesota (Rt. Rev. M. N. Gilbert, D.D.).
Bishop of Mississippi (Rt. Rev. H. M. Thompson, D.D.).
Bishop of Missouri (Rt. Rev. D. S. Tuttle, S.T.D.).
Bishop of Nebraska (Rt. Rev. G. Worthington, D.D.).
Bishop of Newark (Rt. Rev. T. A. Starkey, D.D.).
Bishop of New Hampshire (Rt. Rev. W. W. Niles, D.D.).
Bishop of New York (Rt. Rev. H. C. Potter, D.D.).
Bishop of North Carolina (Rt. Rev. J. B. Cheshire, D.D.).
Bishop of Ohio (Rt. Rev. W. A. Leonard, D.D.).
Bishop of Pennsylvania (Rt. Rev. O. W. Whitaker, D.D.).
Bishop of Pittsburgh (Rt. Rev. C. Whitehead, D.D.).
Bishop of Southern Florida (Rt. Rev. W. C. Gray, D.D.).
Bishop Coadjutor of Southern Ohio (Rt. Rev. B. Vincent, D.D.).
Bishop of Spokane (Rt. Rev. H. L. Wells, D.D.).
Bishop of Springfield (Rt. Rev. G. F. Seymour, D.D.).
Bishop Coadjutor of Springfield (Rt. Rev. C. R. Hale, D.D.).
Bishop of Tennessee (Rt. Rev. C. T. Quintard, S.T.D.).
Bishop of Texas (Rt. Rev. G. H. Kinsolving, D.D.).

Bishop of The Platte (Rt. Rev. A. R. Graves, D.D.).
Bishop of Vermont (Rt. Rev. A. C. A. Hall, D.D.).
Bishop of Washington (Rt. Rev. H. Y. Satterlee, D.D.).
Bishop of Western New York (Rt. Rev. W. D. Walker, S.T.D.).
Bishop of Western Texas (Rt. Rev. J. S. Johnson, D.D.).
Bishop of West Missouri (Rt. Rev. E. R. Atwell, D.D.).
Bishop of Wyoming and Idaho (Rt. Rev. E. Talbot, D.D.).

Missionary Bishop of Cape Palmas (Rt. Rev. S. D. Ferguson, D.D.).
Missionary Bishop of Shanghai (Rt. Rev. F. R. Graves, D.D.).
Missionary Bishop of Tokyo (Rt. Rev. J. McKim, D.D.).

Officers of the Conference:

Bishop of Gloucester (Rt. Rev. C. J. Ellicott), *Registrar.*
Bishop of Winchester (Rt. Rev. R. T. Davidson, D.D.).
Bishop of Bath and Wells (Rt. Rev. G. W. Kennion, D.D.).
} *Episcopal Secretaries.*
F. W. Pennefather, LL.D., *Lay Secretary.*

XII.

Encyclical Letter issued by the Bishops attending the fourth Lambeth Conference, July, 1897. (See p. 42.)

To the Faithful in Christ Jesus, Greeting—

We, Archbishops, Bishops Metropolitan, and other Bishops of the Holy Catholic Church in full communion with the Church of England, one hundred and ninety-four in number, all having superintendence over dioceses or lawfully commissioned to exercise Episcopal functions therein, assembled from divers parts of the earth at Lambeth Palace, in the year of our Lord 1897, under the presidency of the Most Reverend Frederick, by Divine Providence Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of All England, and Metropolitan, after receiving in Westminster Abbey the Blessed Sacrament of the Lord's Body and Blood, and uniting in Prayer for the guidance of the Holy Spirit, have taken into consideration various questions which have been submitted to us affecting the welfare of God's people and the condition of the Church in divers parts of the world.

We have made these matters the subject of careful and serious deliberation during the month past, both in General Conference and in Committees specially appointed to consider the several questions, and we now commend to the faithful the conclusions at which we have arrived.

We have appended to this letter two sets of documents, the one containing the formal Resolutions of the Conference,[1] and the other the Reports of the several

[1] See p. 199.

Committees.[1] We desire you to bear in mind that the Conference is responsible for the first alone. The Reports of Committees can be taken to represent the mind of the Conference in so far only as they are reaffirmed or directly adopted in the Resolutions. But we have thought good to print these Reports, believing that they will offer fruitful matter for consideration.

We begin with the questions which affect moral conduct, inasmuch as moral conduct is made by our Lord the test of the reality of religious life.

Temperance.

Intemperance still continues to be one of the chief hindrances to religion in the great mass of our people. There are many excellent societies engaged in the conflict with it, but they need steady and resolute perseverance to effect any serious improvement. It is important to lay stress on the essential condition of permanent success in this work, namely, that it should be taken up in a religious spirit as part of Christian devotion to the Lord.

Purity.

We desire to repeat with the most earnest emphasis what was said on the subject of Purity by the last Conference, and we reprint herewith the Report which that Conference unanimously adopted.[2] We know the deadly nature of the sin of impurity, the fearful hold it has on those who have once yielded, and the fearful strength of the temptation. The need for calling attention to this is greatly increased at present by the difficulties that hamper all attempts to deal with the frightful diseases which everywhere attend it. We recognise the duty of checking the spread of such diseases, but we recognise also the terrible possibility that the means used for this purpose may lower the moral standard, and so, in the end, foster the evil in the very endeavour to uproot it. We are convinced that

[1] See p. 212. [2] See page 130.

the root of all such evil is in the sin itself, and that nothing will in the end prove effectual against it, which does not from the very first teach the Christian law that the sin is a degradation to those who fall into it, whether men or women, and that purity is within reach of every Christian who, trusting in the Grace of God, fights the battle of his baptismal vow.

Sanctity of Marriage.

The maintenance of the dignity and sanctity of marriage lies at the root of social purity, and therefore of the safety and sacredness of the family and the home. The foundation of its holy security and honour is the precept of our Lord, "What therefore God hath joined together let not man put asunder." We utter our most earnest words of warning against the lightness with which the lifelong vow of marriage is often taken; against the looseness with which those who enter into this holy estate often regard its obligations; and against the frequency and facility of recourse to the Courts of Law for the dissolution of this most solemn bond. The full consideration, however, of this matter it has been impossible to undertake on this occasion.

Industrial Problems.

The industrial problems of the present day present themselves under the double aspect of justice between man and man, and sympathy with human needs. It is widely thought in some classes that the present working of our industries is unjust to the employed and unduly favourable to the employer. It is obviously not possible for us to enter upon the consideration of such a question in detail. But we think it our duty to press the great principle of the Brotherhood of Man, and to urge the importance of bringing that principle to bear on all the relations between those who are connected by the tie of a common employment. Obedience to this law of brotherhood would ultimately, in all probability, prevent many of the mischiefs which attend our present system. Upon this aspect of the

industrial problems wise and helpful counsels will be found in the Report.[1]

The other aspect of these problems concerns those classes of the community who are, above all others, commended by our Lord to the loving care of His disciples, the Poor. It is undeniable that poverty is so far from being regarded in the New Testament as a hindrance to the acceptance of the Gospel, that it is on the contrary the rich as such that are warned that they will find serious difficulty in entering the Kingdom of Heaven. Still the poor have temptations and troubles from which the rich are comparatively free. To give help in such temptations, and to lessen these troubles is one of the special duties of the Christian. Of all the duties that our Lord has imposed on us, none can be said to stand higher than this, but while it is one of the most imperative, it is also one of the most difficult. It is certain that no permanent good can be done to those who find the daily struggle for subsistence very severe, unless they themselves will join in the work. But the perpetual temptation of their lives is to throw off their burdens and expect to obtain aid without any exertion on their own part. Many, perhaps the great majority, rise above this temptation and live brave lives of dependence on their own persevering labour. But many sink in the effort and give up all true manly hope. It is character that they need. They need inspiration. They need to have hope brought to them; they need to be roused to a belief in their power by the help of God to live on higher principles. It is when men of this class are fighting their own battle against their own weakness that they can best be aided by thoughtful sympathy and friendly help. But besides these there are not a few who are caught as it were in some overpowering current of trouble which they cannot deal with. Such are those who cannot find employment though often longing to find it. The difficulty of helping these is well known and requires most careful study. And lastly there are the many who are physically unable to

[1] See p. 265.

maintain themselves; sometimes from congenital weakness, sometimes from accident or disease, sometimes, and indeed most often, from old age. To instil Christian principle into the great body of Churchmen; to press on them the duty of not only being ready to give and glad to communicate, but of giving their time, their trouble, their careful thought to the discovery of the best mode of helping individual cases of need, is the task which our Master gives us. We warmly commend to all Christian people the Report of our Committee on this subject.[1]

International Arbitration.

There is nothing which more tends to promote general employment and consequently genuine comfort among the people than the maintenance of peace among the nations of mankind. But besides and above all considerations of material comfort stands the value of Peace itself as the great characteristic of the Kingdom of our Lord, the word which heralded His entrance into the world, the title which specially distinguishes Him from all earthly princes. There can be no question that the influence of the Christian Church can do more for this than any other influence that can be named. Without denying that there are just wars and that we cannot prevent their recurrence entirely, yet we are convinced that there are other and better ways of settling the quarrels of nations than by fighting. War is a horrible evil followed usually by consequences worse than itself. Arbitration in place of war saves the honour of the nations concerned and yet determines the questions at issue with completeness. War brutalises even while it gives opportunity for the finest heroism. Arbitration leaves behind it a generous sense of passions restrained and justice sought for. The Church of Christ can never have any doubt for which of the two modes of determining national quarrels it ought to strive.

We pass from moral questions to Ecclesiastical, and first to those which may be called Internal.

[1] See p. 265.

The Organisation of the Anglican Communion.

Every Meeting of the Lambeth Conference deepens the feeling of the unity which originally made the Conference possible, and now gives increasing value to its deliberations. There are differences of opinion amongst us, but the sense of belonging to one Body, subject to one Master, striving towards one great aim, grows stronger as the Meetings are repeated. In order to maintain and still further develop this unity of feeling we desire first to secure steady and rapid intercourse between all the branches of the Anglican Communion, for it is certain that thorough mutual knowledge is the only sure basis of all real unity of life. As one step towards this we propose to form a central consultative body for supplying information and advice. This body must win its way to general recognition by the services which it may be able to render to the working of the Church. It can have no other than a moral authority, which will be developed out of its action. We have left the formation of it to the Archbishop of Canterbury, who already finds himself called on to do very much of what is proposed to be done by this Council. Beyond this point we have not thought it wise to go. But we desire to encourage the natural and spontaneous formation of Provinces, so that no Bishop may be left to act absolutely alone, and we think it desirable that, in accordance with the ancient custom of the Western Church, the Metropolitans of these Provinces should be known as Archbishops, recommending, however, that such titles should not be assumed without previous communication to the other Bishops of the Communion with a view to general recognition. We think it would be well for the further consolidation of all provincial action that every Bishop at his consecration should take the Oath of Canonical Obedience to his own Metropolitan, and that every Bishop consecrated in England under the Queen's Mandate for service abroad should make a solemn declaration that he will pay all due honour and deference to the

Archbishop of Canterbury, and will respect and maintain the spiritual rights and privileges of the Church of England and of all Churches in communion with her.

Religious Communities.

On the subject of Religious Communities we do not consider it to be yet possible to give advice which can be treated as final. We believe that such Communities are capable of rendering great services to the Church, and have indeed already done so. But we think more regulation is needed if they are to be worked in thorough harmony with the general work of the Church as a whole. What form such regulation should take requires much further consideration. Meanwhile we express our strong sense of the care that ought to be taken in making sure that no one undertakes the obligations of Community life without having, as far as human judgment can ascertain it, a real vocation from God. Whether God means a particular person to live in this particular way is the preliminary question to be determined by the person who asks to be admitted into a Community and by the authority of the Community that admits that person. We have requested the Committee to continue its labours, and we commend the Report to the attention of the Church.[1]

The Critical Study of the Bible.

We pass on to the consideration of the standards of all our teaching, the Bible and the Book of Common Prayer. The critical study of the Bible by competent scholars is essential to the maintenance in the Church of a healthy faith. That faith is already in serious danger which refuses to face questions that may be raised either on the authority or the genuineness of any part of the Scriptures that have come down to us. Such refusal creates painful suspicion in the minds of many whom we have to teach, and will weaken the strength of our own conviction of the truth that God has revealed to us. A faith which is always

[1] See p. 215.

or often attended by a secret fear that we dare not inquire lest inquiry should lead us to results inconsistent with what we believe, is already infected with a disease which may soon destroy it. But all inquiry is attended with a danger on the other side unless it be protected by the guard of Reverence, Confidence, and Patience. It is quite true that there have been instances where inquiry has led to doubt and ultimately to infidelity. But the best safeguard against such a peril lies in that deep reverence which never fails to accompany real faith. The central object of Christian faith must always be the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. The test which St. Paul gives of the possession of the Holy Spirit is the being able to say that Jesus is the Lord. If a man can say with his whole heart and soul that Jesus is the Lord, he stands on a rock which nothing can shake. Read in the light of this conviction, the Bible, beginning with man made in the image of God, and rising with ever-increasing clearness of revelation to GOD taking on Him the form of man, and throughout it all showing in every page the sense of the Divine Presence inspiring what is said, will not fail to exert its power over the souls of men till the Lord comes again. This power will never really be affected by any critical study whatever. The Report of the Committee deals in our judgment temperately and wisely, with the subject, and we think all Christian people will find it worthy of careful consideration.[1]

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.

The Book of Common Prayer, next to the Bible itself, is the authoritative standard of the doctrine of the Anglican Communion. The great doctrines of the Faith are there clearly set forth in their true relative proportion. And we hold that it would be most dangerous to tamper with its teaching either by narrowing the breadth of its comprehension, or by disturbing the balance of its doctrine. We do not speak of any omission or modification

[1] See p. 218.

which might have the effect of practically denying an article in one of the Creeds, for that would be not only dangerous but a direct betrayal of the Faith. Nevertheless it is true that no Book can supply every possible need of worshippers in every variation of local circumstances. We therefore think it our duty to affirm the right of every Bishop, within the jurisdiction assigned to him by the Church, to set forth or to sanction additional services and prayers when he believes that God's work may be thereby furthered, or the spiritual needs of the worshippers more fully met, and to adapt the Prayers already in the Book to the special requirements of his own people. But we hold that this power must always be subject to any limitations imposed by the provincial or other lawful authority, and the utmost care must be taken that all such additions or adaptations be in thorough harmony with the spirit and tenor of the whole Book.

We find that many of the Clergy, especially in the large towns of England, are troubled by doubts whether, in the present circumstances of life, especially where population is perpetually moving, infants ought to be baptised when there seems so little security for their due instruction. We desire to impress upon the Clergy the need of taking all possible care to see that provision is made for the Christian training of the child, but that, unless in cases of grave and exceptional difficulty, the baptism should not be deferred. We consider, further, that the baptismal promises of repentance, faith, and obedience should be made either privately or publicly by those who, having been baptised without those promises, are brought by our Clergy to Confirmation by the Bishop.

Difficulties having arisen in some quarters with regard to the administration of Holy Communion to the Sick, we recommend that such difficulties should be left to be dealt with by the Bishop of each Diocese in accordance with the direction contained in the preface to the Book of Common Prayer "Concerning the Service of the Church."

"Readers" used in Schools.

We think it necessary to call attention to the misleading character of many of the statements to be found in those School "Readers" which touch on the history of the Church, and we recommend those on whom responsibility rests to take such steps as they can to secure a truer handling of this important subject.

Encouragement of Theological Study.

There is a general complaint that the facilities provided for theological study in many of the Colonies and Dependencies of Great Britain are not sufficient, and that there is very little recognition of proficiency in theological knowledge. It is a serious defect in the working of the Church if it fails to produce men who can deal rightly with theological questions. The wrong handling of such questions may easily lead and has often led to serious errors both in doctrine and practice, and ignorance of the subject leaves the Church defenceless against many attacks. The Church cannot fulfil all her duties without having men of learning among her divines, and this especially applies to such a Church as ours, which founds all her teaching on Scripture and antiquity. The great means provided by God for instructing the conscience of the human race is the Bible, and for interpreting the Bible, next after the Bible itself, the study of the writings and practices of the primitive Church is of paramount importance. We cannot use these instruments with effect unless we have a thorough knowledge of both. We, therefore, earnestly commend to all Christian people, and especially to those who are connected by commercial or other relations with the Colonies, the duty of aiding and establishing colleges and scholarships for the instruction of Colonial students in theology, and we commend to the careful consideration of the Church the question how best to encourage men to give themselves to that study by arranging that some accredited authority

shall grant degrees to those who have attained a high standard of proficiency.

The Duty of the Church to the Colonies.

We have just spoken of one of the duties which the Church owes to the Colonies, but there are others of no small importance. It is a duty to the Colonies to encourage the freest and fullest communion of spiritual life between the Churchmen at home and the Churchmen abroad, and especially between the Clergy. Clergymen well fitted for colonial service are not always well fitted for home service, and Clergymen well fitted for home service are not always well fitted for colonial. And this must, to a certain extent, put a restraint on free exchange of Clergy between the two services. But subject to this necessary caution, it is good for the Church that men should go from the one service to the other, and under proper regulations this ought not to be difficult.

To this claim of the Colonies must be added the claim on behalf of some of them for continued and, if possible, increased pecuniary aid. Many of the Colonial Churches cannot yet stand alone. The provision of colleges and schools and of endowments for Bishoprics and the like, though we are bound to contemplate its withdrawal in course of time, yet must be maintained for the present, if we do not wish the work already done to be undone for want of funds. The colonists are our own kin, and we cannot leave them to drift away from the Church of their fathers. And the demands on us will inevitably increase. God is opening to us every day new gates of access to the heathen world, and we must enter those gates, and yet what we are already doing will still need to be done if we are to be true to the call which the Lord is making.

Again, it is our duty, and must continue for some time to be our duty, to do what we can for the Christian care of emigrants on their way, as well as to supply them with letters of commendation addressed to those who will take

an interest in their spiritual welfare. And finally, it is an imperative duty to give all possible assistance to the Bishops and Clergy of the Colonies in their endeavours to protect the native races from the introduction among them of demoralising influences, especially the mischief of the trade in intoxicating liquors and noxious drugs.

Our duties to the Colonies in all spiritual matters are undeniably heavy. But the great task of evangelising the human race is largely put upon us, and we cannot shrink from bearing the burden.

We pass from what is internal concerning the Anglican Communion to what is external.

The Unity of the Church.

On the Unity of the Church our Committee has not been able to propose any resolutions which would bind us to immediate further action. A Committee has been appointed to open correspondence with a view to establish a clearer understanding and closer relations with the Churches of the East. The Archbishop of Canterbury has been requested to appoint Committees to look into the position of the *Unitas Fratrum* and the Scandinavian Church, with both of which we desire to cultivate the most friendly possible relations. We recommend also that every opportunity be taken to emphasise the Divine purpose of visible unity amongst Christians as a fact of revelation. We recommend that Committees of Bishops be appointed everywhere to watch for and originate opportunities of united prayer and mutual conference between representatives of different Christian Bodies, and to give counsel where counsel may be asked: these Committees to report to the next Lambeth Conference what has been accomplished in this matter.

Above all, we urge the duty of special intercession for the Unity of the Church in accordance with the Lord's Own Prayer, as recorded in the Gospel of St. John.

Reformation Movements outside our Communion.

We recognise with warm sympathy the endeavours that are being made to escape from the usurped authority of the See of Rome as we ourselves regained our freedom three centuries ago. We are well aware that such movements may sometimes end in quitting not merely the Roman obedience, but the Catholic Church itself, and surrendering the doctrine of the Sacraments, or even some of the great verities of the Creeds. But we must not anticipate that men will go wrong until they have begun to do so, and we feel some confidence in expressing our warm desire for friendly relations with the Old Catholic Community in Germany, with the Christian Catholic Church in Switzerland and with the Old Catholics in Austria; our attitude of hopeful interest in the endeavour to form an autonomous Church in Mexico and in the work now being done in Brazil; and our sympathy with the brave and earnest men (if we may use the words of the Conference of 1888) of France, Italy, Spain, and Portugal, who have been driven to free themselves from the burden of unlawful terms of Communion imposed by the Church of Rome.

Foreign Missions.

Lastly, we come to the subject of Foreign Missions, the work that at the present time stands in the first rank of all the tasks we have to fulfil. We have especial reasons to be thankful to God for the awakened and increasing zeal of our whole Communion for this primary work of the Church, the work for which the Church was commissioned by our Lord. For some centuries it may be said we have slumbered. The duty has not been quite forgotten, but it has been remembered only by individuals and Societies; the body as a whole has taken no part. The Book of Common Prayer contains very few prayers for missionary work. It hardly seems to have been present to the minds of our great authorities and leaders in compiling that Book

that the matter should be in the thought of everyone who calls himself a Christian, and that no ordinary service should be considered complete which did not plead amongst other things for the spread of the Gospel. We are beginning, though only beginning, to see what the Lord would have us do. He is opening the whole world to our easy access, and as He opens the way He is opening our eyes to see it, and to see His beckoning hand.

In preaching His Gospel to the world we have to deal with one great religious body, which holds the truth in part but not in its fulness, the Jews; with another which withholds fragments of the truth embedded in a mass of falsehood, the Mohammedans; and with various races which hold inherited beliefs ranging down to the merest fetichism. In dealing with all these it is certainly right to recognise whatsoever good they may contain. But it is necessary to be cautious lest that good, such as it is, be so exaggerated as to lead us to allow that any purified form of any one of them can ever be in any sense a substitute for the Gospel. The Gospel is not merely the revelation of the highest morality; it reveals also the wonderful love of God in Christ, and contains the promise of that grace given by Him by which alone the highest moral life is possible to man. And without the promise of that grace it would not be the Gospel at all.

The Jews seem to deserve from us more attention than they have hitherto received. The difficulties of the work of converting the Jews are very great, but the greatest of all difficulties springs from the indifference of Christians to the duty of bringing them to Christ. They are the Lord's own kin, and He commanded that the Gospel should first be preached to them. But Christians generally are much more interested in the conversion of Gentiles. The conversion of the Jews is also much hindered by the severe persecutions to which Jewish converts are often exposed from their own people, and it is sometimes necessary to see to their protection if they are persuaded to join us. It seems probable that the English-

speaking people can do more than any others in winning them, and, although Jewish converts have one advantage in their knowledge of their own people, yet they are put at a great disadvantage by the extremely strong prejudice which the Jews entertain against those who have left them for Christ. It seems best that both Jews and Gentiles should be employed in the work.

For preaching to the Mohammedans very careful preparation is needed. The men who are to do the work must study their character, their history, and their creed. The Mohammedans must be approached with the greatest care to do them justice. What is good in their belief must be acknowledged to the full, and used as a foundation on which to build the structure of Christian truth. They have been most obstinate in opposing the Christian faith, but there seem now to be openings for reaching their consciences. It is easier for them to join us than it was. In some lands the intolerance, which was their great bulwark, is showing indications of giving way. In India the Christian and the Mohammedan meet on equal terms, and a Mohammedan can become a Christian without danger to his life. It seems as if the time for approaching them had come, and that the call to approach them was made especially on ourselves. To this end it is necessary that we should have the services of men specially trained for the purpose. Such men will, as it seems, be most effective if working from strong centres, such as are to be found in Delhi, Lucknow, and Hyderabad (Deccan). To find such men and urge them to the work; to provide for their thorough training in proper colleges, and to send them forth, never singly, but, if possible, in large groups, appears to be the best means of dealing with the whole Mohammedan Body.

The remaining religions of the world require a varied treatment in accordance with the circumstances of each particular case. It is often said that we ought to aim at developing Native Churches as speedily as possible. But it is necessary to move with caution in this matter. It is

of real importance to impress the converts from the first with a sense that the Church is their own and not a foreign Church, and for that purpose to give them some share in the local management and the financial support of the body which they have joined. But before it is justifiable to give them independent action it is necessary to wait until they have acquired that sense of duty which is needed to keep them in the right way. They must have learned to realise the high moral standard of the Gospel in their ordinary lives, and they must have learned to fulfil the universal duty of maintaining their own ministry. Nothing ought to be laid on them but what is of the essence of the Faith or belongs to the due order of the Catholic Church, but they should be perpetually impressed with the necessity of holding the Catholic Faith in its integrity, and maintaining their unity with the Catholic Body. That unity should be sought first in the unity of the Diocese, and when members of the Church move from Diocese to Diocese they should be supplied with letters of commendation to persons who will interest themselves in the spiritual welfare of such travellers.

The work of Foreign Missions may occasionally bring about apparent collision between different Churches within our Communion. In all such cases pains should be taken to prevent as far as possible the unseemliness of two Bishops exercising their jurisdiction in the same place, and the synods concerned ought in our judgment to make canons or pass resolutions to secure this object. Where there has been already an infringement of the rule the Bishops must make all the endeavours they can to adjust the matter for the time.

In all cases we are of opinion that if any new foreign missionary jurisdiction be contemplated, notification should be sent to all Metropolitans and Presiding Bishops before any practical steps are taken.

We think it our duty to declare that in the Foreign Mission field, where signal spiritual blessings have attended the labours of missionaries not connected with our

Communion, a special obligation has arisen to avoid, as far as possible without compromise of principle, whatever tends to prevent the due growth and manifestation of that "unity of the Spirit" which should ever mark the Church of Christ.

In conclusion we commend to the consideration of all our Churches the suggestions contained in the Report of the Committee on Foreign Missions as to the relation of Missionary Bishops and Clergy to Missionary Societies.[1]

We have now said what we have to say. We have throughout our deliberations endeavoured to bear in mind the great work that we are engaged in doing and the presence with us of the Lord and Master who has given us this work to do. The effort to counsel one another and to counsel the members of our Church throughout the world, has drawn us consciously nearer to Him whom we have been desiring to serve. We pray earnestly that as He has been with us in our deliberations, so also He may be with us in all our attempts to live and to labour in the same spirit of devotion. We know that we can do nothing without Him, and we pray that that knowledge may perpetually lift our thoughts to His very self and inspire our work with the zeal and the perseverance, with the humility and the self-surrender which ever characterise His true disciples; so that we all may be able to abide in Him and to obtain His loving promise to abide in us.

Signed on behalf of the Conference,

F: CANTUAR:

C. J. GLOUCESTER, *Registrar.*

RANDALL WINTON:
G. W. BATH & WELLS: } *Episcopal Secretaries.*

F. W. PENNEFATHER, LL.D., *Lay Secretary.*

July 31st, 1897.

[1] See p. 237.

XIII.

RESOLUTIONS FORMALLY ADOPTED BY THE CONFERENCE OF 1897. (See p. 42.)

1. That, recognising the advantages which have accrued to the Church from the meetings of the Lambeth Conferences, we are of opinion that it is of great importance to the well-being of the Church that there should be from time to time meetings of the Bishops of the whole Anglican Communion for the consideration of questions that may arise affecting the Church of Christ.

2. That whereas the Lambeth Conferences have been called into existence by the invitation of the Archbishop of Canterbury, we desire that similar Conferences should be held, at intervals of about ten years, on the invitation of the Archbishop, if he be willing to give it.

3. That the Resolutions adopted by such Conferences should be formally communicated to the various National Churches, Provinces, and extra-Provincial Dioceses of the Anglican Communion for their consideration, and for such action as may seem to them desirable.

4. That the conditions of membership of the Lambeth Conferences, as described in the opening sentences of the Official Letter of 1878 and the Encyclical Letter of 1888, should remain unaltered.[1]

5. That it is advisable that a consultative body should be formed to which resort may be had, if desired, by the National Churches, Provinces, and extra-Provincial Dioceses of the Anglican Communion either for information or for advice, and that the Archbishop of Canterbury be

[1] See pp. 82 and 106.

requested to take such steps as he may think most desirable for the creation of this consultative body.

6. We desire to record our satisfaction at the progress of the acceptance of the principle of Provincial organisation since the date of its formal commendation to the Anglican Communion in the Official Letter of 1878.[1] We would also express a hope that the method of association into Provinces may be carried still further as circumstances may allow.

7. Recognising the almost universal custom in the Western Church of attaching the title of Archbishop to the rank of Metropolitan, we are of opinion that the revival and extension of this custom among ourselves is justifiable and desirable. It is advisable that the proposed adoption of such a title should be formally announced to the Bishops of the various Churches and Provinces of the Communion with a view to its general recognition.

8. We are of opinion that the Archiepiscopal or Primatial title may be taken from a city or from a territory, according to the discretion of the Province concerned.

9. Where it is intended that any Bishop-elect, not under the metropolitan jurisdiction of the See of Canterbury, should be consecrated in England under the Queen's Mandate, it is desirable, if it be possible, that he should not be expected to take an oath of personal obedience to the Archbishop of Canterbury, but rather should, before his Consecration, make a solemn declaration that he will pay all due honour and deference to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and will respect and maintain the spiritual rights and privileges of the Church of England, and of all Churches in communion with her. In this manner the interests of unity would be maintained without any infringement of the local liberties or jurisdiction.

10. If such Bishop-elect be designated to a See within any Primatial or Provincial Jurisdiction, it is desirable that he should at his Consecration take the customary Oath of Canonical Obedience to his own Primate or Metropolitan.

[1] See above, p. 84.

11. That this Conference recognises with thankfulness the revival alike of Brotherhoods and Sisterhoods and of the Office of Deaconess, in our branch of the Church, and commends to the attention of the Church the Report of the Committee appointed to consider the Relation of Religious Communities to the Episcopate.[1]

12. In view of the importance of the further development and wise direction of such Communities, the Conference requests the Committee to continue its labours, and to present a further Report to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, in July, 1898.

---

13. That this Conference receives the Report drawn up by the Committee upon the Critical Study of Holy Scripture, and commends it to the consideration of all Christian people.[2]

---

14. That while we heartily thank God for the missionary zeal which He has kindled in our Communion, and for the abundant blessing bestowed on such work as has been done, we recommend that prompt and continuous efforts be made to arouse the Church to recognise as a necessary and constant element in the spiritual life of the Body, and of each member of it, the fulfilment of our Lord's great commission to evangelise all nations.

15. That the tendency of many English-speaking Christians to entertain an exaggerated opinion of the excellences of Hinduism and Buddhism, and to ignore the fact that Jesus Christ alone has been constituted Saviour and King of Mankind, should be vigorously corrected.

16. That a more prominent position be assigned to the Evangelisation of the Jews in the intercessions and almsgiving of the Church, and that the various Boards of Missions be requested to take cognisance of this work; and particularly to see that care be taken for the due training of the Missionary Agents to be employed in the work.

17. That in view (1) of the success which has already attended faithful work among the Mohammedans, (2) of

[1] See p. 215. [2] See p. 218.

the opportunity offered at the present time for more vigorous efforts, especially in India and in the Hausa district, and (3) of the need of special training for the work: it is desirable—

(*a*) That men be urged to offer themselves with a view to preparation by special study for Mission Work among Mohammedans.

(*b*) That attention be called to the importance of creating or maintaining strong centres for work amongst Mohammedans, as, for instance, in the cities of Delhi, Lucknow, and Hyderabad (Deccan), and elsewhere.

18. That while we feel that there is much to encourage us in what has been done, and is now in progress, for the establishment and development of Native Churches, we consider it to be of the utmost importance that from the very beginning the idea that the Church is their own and not a foreign Church should be impressed upon converts, and that a due share of the management and financial support of the Church should be theirs from the first. But we hold that the power of independent action, which is closely connected with the establishment of a native episcopate, ought not as a rule to be confided to Native Churches until they are also financially independent.

19. That it is important that, so far as possible, the Church should be adapted to local circumstances, and the people brought to feel in all ways that no burdens in the way of foreign customs are laid upon them, and nothing is required of them but what is of the essence of the Faith, and belongs to the due order of the Catholic Church.

20. That while the converts should be encouraged to seek independence of foreign financial aid, and to look forward to complete independence, care should be taken to impress upon them the necessity of holding the Catholic Faith in its integrity, and of maintaining at all times that union with the great body of the Church which will strengthen the life of the young Church, and prevent any

departure from Catholic and Apostolic unity, whether through heresy or through schism.

21. That due care should be taken to make the Diocese the centre of unity, so that, while there may be contained in the same area under one Bishop various races and languages necessitating many modes of administration, nothing shall be allowed to obscure the fact that the many races form but one Church.

22. That Bishops and Clergy engaged in Missionary work should give to those of their flock who may travel to other countries letters of commendation in each case, to persons who will interest themselves in the spiritual welfare of such travellers.

23. That this Conference desires to give expression to its deep sense of the evils resulting from the Drink Traffic on the West Coast of Africa and elsewhere, and of the hindrance which it presents not only to the development of Native Churches, but also to the acceptance of Christianity by heathen tribes.

24. That, while it is the duty of the whole Church to make disciples of all nations, yet, in the discharge of this duty, independent Churches of the Anglican Communion ought to recognise the equal rights of each other when establishing foreign missionary jurisdictions, so that two Bishops of that Communion may not exercise jurisdiction in the same place, and the Conference recommends every Bishop to use his influence in the diocesan and provincial synods of his particular Church to gain the adhesion of the synods to these principles, with a view to the framing of canons or resolutions in accord therewith. Where such rights have, through inadvertence, been infringed in the past, an adjustment of the respective positions of the Bishops concerned ought to be made by an amicable arrangement between them, with a view to correcting as far as possible the evils arising from such infringement.

25. That when any particular Church contemplates creating a new foreign missionary jurisdiction, the recommendation contained in Resolution I. of the Conference of

1867 [1] ought always to be followed before any practical steps are taken.

26. That this Conference earnestly commends to the consideration of the Churches of the Anglican Communion the suggestions contained in the Report of the Committee on Foreign Missions as to the relation of Missionary Bishops and Clergy to Missionary Societies.[2]

27. That in the Foreign Mission Field of the Church's work, where signal spiritual blessings have attended the labours of Christian Missionaries not connected with the Anglican Communion, a special obligation has arisen to avoid, as far as possible without compromise of principle, whatever tends to prevent the due growth and manifestation of that "unity of the Spirit," which should ever mark the Church of Christ.

---

28. That in accordance with the sentiments expressed by the Bishops who met in the last Conference, we regard it as our duty to maintain and promote friendly relations with the Old Catholic Community in Germany, and with the Christian Catholic Church in Switzerland, assuring them of our sympathy, of our thankfulness to God who has held them steadfast in their efforts for the preservation of the Primitive Faith and Order, and Who, through all discouragements, difficulties, and temptations, has given them the assurance of His blessing, in the maintenance of their principles, in the enlargement of their congregations, and in the increase of their Churches. We continue the offer of the religious privileges by which the Clergy and faithful Laity may be admitted to Holy Communion on the same conditions as our own Communicants.

29. That we renew the expression of hope for a more formal relation with the Old Catholics in Austria, when their organisation shall have been made more complete.

30. That we recognise thankfully the movement for the formation of an autonomous Church in Mexico, organised upon the primitive lines of administration, and having a Liturgy and Book of Offices approved by the Presiding

[1] See above, p. 54. [2] See p. 237.

Bishop of the Church in the United States and his Advisory Committee as being framed after the primitive forms of worship.

31. That we express our sympathy with the Reformation movement in Brazil, and trust that it may develop in accordance with sound principles.

32. That we repeat the expressions of sympathy (contained in the Report of the Lambeth Conference of 1888) [1] with the brave and earnest men of France, Italy, Spain, and Portugal who have been driven to free themselves from the burden of unlawful terms of Communion imposed by the Church of Rome; and continue to watch these movements with deep and anxious interest, praying that they may be blessed and guided by Almighty God.

33. That we recommend to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Primates and Presiding Bishops of other Churches in Communion with the Church of England the appointment of at least one representative of each Church to attend the International Congress which is to meet in Vienna on August 30th, 1897; and we express the hope that there may be a revival of such Conferences as those held at Bonn in 1874 and 1875 to which representatives may be invited and appointed from the Church of England and the Churches in Communion with her.

---

34. That every opportunity be taken to emphasise the Divine purpose of visible unity amongst Christians, as a fact of revelation.

35. That this Conference urges the duty of special intercession for the unity of the Church in accordance with our Lord's own prayer.

36. That the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the Bishop of London be requested to act as a Committee with power to add to their number, to confer personally or by correspondence with the Orthodox Eastern Patriarchs, the "Holy Governing Synod" of the Church of Russia, and the chief authorities of the various Eastern Churches with a view to consider the possibility of securing a clearer

[1] See above, p. 165.

understanding and of establishing closer relations between the Churches of the East and the Anglican Communion; and that under the direction of the said Committee arrangements be made for the translation of books and documents setting forth the relative positions of the various Churches, and also of such Catechisms and Forms of Service as may be helpful to mutual understanding.

37. That this Conference not possessing sufficient information to warrant the expression of a decided opinion upon the question of the Orders of the *Unitas Fratrum* or Moravians, must content itself with expressing a hearty desire for such relations with them as will aid the cause of Christian Unity, and with recommending that there should be on the part of the Anglican Communion further consideration of the whole subject, in the hope of establishing closer relations between the *Unitas Fratrum* and the Churches represented in this Conference.

38. That the Archbishop of Canterbury be requested to appoint a Committee to conduct the further investigation of the subject, and for such purpose to confer with the authorities or representatives of the *Unitas Fratrum*.

39. That this Conference, being desirous of furthering the action taken by the Lambeth Conference of 1888 with regard to the validity of the Orders of the Swedish Church, requests the Archbishop of Canterbury to appoint a Committee to inquire into the question, and to report to the next Lambeth Conference; and that it is desirable that the Committee, if appointed, should confer with the authorities or representatives of the Church of Sweden upon the subject of the proposed investigation.

40. That the Bishops of the several Churches of the Anglican Communion be urged to appoint Committees of Bishops, where they have not been already appointed, to watch for opportunities of united prayer and mutual conference between representatives of different Christian bodies, and to give counsel where counsel may be asked in this matter. That these Committees confer with and assist each other, and regard themselves as responsible for

reporting to the next Lambeth Conference what has been accomplished in this respect.

41. That this Conference, while disclaiming any purpose of laying down rules for the conduct of International Arbitration, or of suggesting the special methods by which it should proceed, desire to affirm its profound conviction of the value of the principle of International Arbitration, and its essential consistency with the Religion of Jesus Christ.

42. That this Conference welcomes the indications of a more enlightened public conscience on the subject of International Arbitration, and desires to call the attention of all Christian people to the evidence of the healthier state of feeling afforded by the action of Legislatures, and in the increasing literature on the subject.

43. That this Conference, believing that nothing more strongly makes for peace than a healthy and enlightened public opinion, urges upon all Christian people the duty of promoting by earnest prayer, by private instruction, and by public appeal, the cause of International Arbitration.

44. That this Conference receives the report of the Committee on the duty of the Church in regard to Industrial Problems, and commends the suggestions embodied in it to the earnest and sympathetic consideration of all Christian people.[1]

45. That this Conference recognises the exclusive right of each Bishop to put forth or sanction additional services for use within his jurisdiction, subject to such limitations as may be imposed by the provincial or other lawful authority.

46. That this Conference also recognises in each Bishop within his jurisdiction the exclusive right of adapting the Services in the Book of Common Prayer to local circumstances, and also of directing or sanctioning the use of additional prayers, subject to such limitations as may be imposed by provincial or other lawful authority, provided

[1] See p. 265.

also that any such adaptation shall not affect the doctrinal teaching or value of the Service or passage thus adapted.

47. That the Archbishop of Canterbury be requested to take such steps as may be necessary for the retranslation of the *Quicunque Vult*.

48. That in the opinion of this Conference it is of much importance that in all cases of Infant Baptism the clergyman should take all possible care to see that provision is made for the Christian training of the child, but that, unless in cases of grave and exceptional difficulty, the baptism should not be deferred.

49. That the baptismal promises of repentance, faith, and obedience should be made either privately or publicly by those who having been baptised without those promises, are brought by our Clergy to Confirmation by the Bishop.

50. Where difficulties arise in regard to the administration of Holy Communion to the sick, we recommend that these difficulties should be left to be dealt with by the Bishop of each Diocese in accordance with the direction contained in the preface to the Prayer Book of the Church of England Concerning the Service of the Church:—

"And forasmuch as nothing can be so plainly set forth, but doubts may arise in the use and practice of the same; to appease all such diversity (if any arise) and for the resolution of all doubts, concerning the manner how to understand, do, and execute the things contained in this Book; the parties that so doubt, or diversely take anything, shall alway resort to the Bishop of the Diocese, who by his discretion shall take order for the quieting and appeasing of the same; so that the same order be not contrary to anything contained in this Book. And if the Bishop of the Diocese be in doubt, then he may send for the resolution thereof to the Archbishop."

---

51. That this Conference welcomes heartily the proposal for the temporary employment of younger clergy in service abroad as likely to lead to the great benefit of the Church

at home, of the Church in the colonies, and of the Church at large.

52. That the Conference requests the Bishops of the Church of England to grant the same privilege to Clergymen temporarily serving in any of the Missionary Jurisdictions of the United States, with the consent of their Diocesan, which they accord to Clergymen serving in the colonies.

53. That it is the duty of Church people in England to give aid to education in the colonies, whether generally or in the training for the ministry and for the work of teaching:—

(*a*) In the establishment and strengthening of Church schools and colleges;

(*b*) In the establishment of studentships in England and in the colonies tenable by men living in the colonies, and under preparation for colonial Church work.

54. That the Endowment of new Sees wherever needed, and the augmentation of the Endowment of existing Sees wherever inadequate, deserve the attention and support of the Church at home.

55. That, in the judgment of this Conference, it is the bounden duty of those who derive income from colonial property or securities to contribute to the support of the Church's work in the colonies.

56. That while the principle of gradual withdrawal of home aid to the Church in the colonies, according to its growth, is sound policy, the greatest circumspection should be used, and the special circumstances of each case most carefully examined before aid is withdrawn from even long-established Dioceses.

57. That this Conference desires to draw renewed attention to the recommendation of the Committee of the Lambeth Conference, 1888, on the subject of Emigrants,[1] and recommends that every care should be taken, by home

[1] See above, p. 141.

teaching, by commendatory letters, and by correspondence between the home Dioceses and the Dioceses to which emigrants go, to prevent them from drifting from the Church of their fathers when they leave their old homes.

58. That this Conference desires that every care should be taken by the Church at home to impress upon emigrants the duty of helping to provide for the maintenance of the Church in the country to which they emigrate.

59. That it is the duty of the Church to aid in providing for the moral and spiritual needs of our seamen of the mercantile service, who in vast numbers visit colonial ports, by means of Sailors' Homes and like institutions, and by the ministrations of Clergy specially set apart for this work.

60. That it is the duty of the Church to give all possible assistance to the Bishops and Clergy of the Colonies in their endeavour to protect native races from the introduction among them of demoralising influences and from every form of injustice or oppression, inasmuch as these, wherever found, are a discredit to Christian civilisation and a hindrance to the spread of the Gospel of Christ our Lord.

---

61. That this Conference commends to the consideration of the duly constituted authorities of the several Branches of the Anglican Communion, the Report of the Committee on "Degrees in Divinity" with a view to their taking such steps as to them may seem fit, to meet the need of encouraging, especially among the Clergy, the study of Theology; and that the Archbishop of Canterbury be requested to consider the recommendations contained in the Report, with a view to action in the directions indicated, if His Grace should think such action desirable.[1]

62. That this Conference is of opinion that, failing any consent on the part of existing Authorities to grant Degrees or Certificates in Divinity without requiring residence, and under suitable conditions, to residents in the Colonies and elsewhere, it is desirable that a Board of Examinations in

[1] See p. 283.

Divinity, under the Archbishops and Bishops of the Anglican Communion, should be established, with power to hold Local Examinations, and confer Titles and grant Certificates for proficiency in Theological Study.

---

63. Several causes have combined to create a desire for information on the history of the Anglican Church, especially in the early and mediæval times, but, while recognising with thankfulness the interest now shown in the history of the Church, we think it necessary to call attention to the inadequate and misleading character of the teaching on this point incidentally contained in some of the "Historical Readers" which are put into the hands of the young. We recommend that the Bishops in all Dioceses should inquire into the nature of the books used, and should take steps to effect improvements; and that manuals written in a non-controversial spirit should be prepared to enable teachers to give correctly the oral explanation of the Elementary Readers.

XIV.

N.B.—*The following Reports must be taken as having the authority only of the Committees by whom they were respectively prepared and presented. The Committees were not in every case unanimous in adopting the Reports. The Conference, as a whole, is responsible only for the formal Resolutions agreed to after discussion, and printed above, pages* 199 *to* 211.

No. 1.

Report of the Committee[1] *appointed to consider and report upon the subject of the organisation of the Anglican Communion*—(a) *a Central Consultative Body;* (b) *a Tribunal of Reference;* (c) *the Relation of Primates and Metropolitans in the Colonies and elsewhere to the See of Canterbury;* (d) *the Position and Functions of the Lambeth Conference.*

The Committee, in presenting its Report with the accompanying Resolutions, recalls to the Conference that in the first session at

[1] Names of the Members of the Committee:—

Bishop of Albany.
Archbishop of Armagh.
Bishop of Auckland.
Bishop Barry.
Bishop of Bath and Wells.
" Brechin.
" Capetown.
" Calcutta.
" Colombo.
Archbishop of Dublin.
Bishop of Edinburgh.
" Grahamstown.
" Hereford.
" Jamaica.
" Kentucky.
Bishop of Manchester.
" Maryland.
" Mississippi.
" Missouri.
" New York.
Archbishop of Ontario.
Bishop of Pennsylvania.
" Ripon.
" Rochester.
Archbishop of Rupertsland.
Bishop of Salisbury (*Chairman*).
" Sydney.
" Tasmania.
" Toronto.
" Wellington (*Secretary*)

which the subjects referred to it were discussed the order of consideration was (1) the position and functions of the Lambeth Conference; (2) a central consultative body; (3) a tribunal of reference; (4) the relation of Primates and Metropolitans to the See of Canterbury. It has, therefore, adopted this order in its Reports and Resolutions.

Each decade as it passes brings out more clearly the importance of our duty to maintain and develop the unity and coherence of the Anglican Communion. We learn to realise more and more explicitly the value of the unique combination of respect for authority and consciousness of freedom in the truth, which distinguishes the great body in which God has called us to minister. We begin to perceive in what degree it may impress the rest of Christendom, and in union, in God's good time, with the rest of Christendom, may impress the world in accordance with our Lord's desire (S. John xvii. 21, 23). We also grow more conscious, as time goes on, what are the lessons which the different portions of our Communion may learn from one another. Yet at the same time we perceive that there are tendencies within and without which require to be directed or guarded against with the greatest watchfulness and foresight, if this characteristic type of unity is to be maintained and thus to appeal to the intellect, the imagination and the heart of mankind.

The Lambeth Conferences of the last thirty years have been the most obvious expressions of this unity, and their services to the creation of the desired impression can hardly be overestimated. We can point to resolutions passed by these Conferences which have largely guided the practice of the Provinces of our Communion: and their indirect influence in proving the possibility of such meetings for counsel, and in perfecting their methods, in bringing home to ourselves the nature and bearings of our work, in checking undue tendencies to divergence, and in exhibiting to others our brotherly fellowship, is equally manifest. We therefore submit the accompanying resolutions which in our judgment sufficiently describe the functions and position of the Lambeth Conferences, and their relation towards the Churches and Provinces whose Bishops take part in them.

Keeping in mind the ancient principle "Quod omnes similiter tangit ab omnibus approbetur," we have endeavoured to consider in what ways, under present circumstances, the unity and responsibility of the whole body may receive practical recognition, beyond that which it gains from the resolutions and opinions expressed from time to time by the Lambeth Conferences. We have, therefore, next turned our attention to the questions referred to us regarding a central consultative body and a tribunal of reference. The Committee hopes that it has in a measure overcome the difficulty of reconciling what may be theoretically desirable with

what is practically possible in the Resolutions which it now submits to the Conference on these two branches of the question.[1]

We have also given our attention to some general questions affecting Provincial organisation, as well as to that of the relation of Primates and Metropolitans in the colonies and elsewhere to the See of Canterbury. We hope that the conclusions we have arrived at upon these delicate questions may do something to establish the great principles, the promotion of which we believe to be the chief function of our Committee.

JOHN SARUM,

July 21st, 1897. *Chairman.*

Note.

The Editor of the Report published in 1879 was directed by the President of the Conference, in accordance with the request of the Committee, to state that the proposed Resolutions on the subject of a tribunal of reference were as follows :—

"That it is advisable that a tribunal of reference be appointed, to which may be referred any question submitted by Bishops of the Church of England, or by Colonial and Missionary Churches.

"That it is expedient that the Archbishop of Canterbury should preside over the tribunal, and that it should further consist of the Archbishop of York, the Bishops of London, Durham, and Winchester, and representatives of each province not in the British Isles which may determine to accept the decisions of the tribunal: the Bishops of each such province having the right to elect and appoint any one Bishop of the Anglican Communion for every ten or fraction of ten Dioceses of which it may consist: and that the tribunal have power to request the advice of experts in any matter which may be submitted to them."

These Resolutions were considered by the Conference, but after discussion it was decided that they should not be put.

[1] See note.

No. 2.

Report of Committee[1] *appointed to consider the subject of the Relation of Religious Communities within the Church to the Episcopate, and to report in the concluding session of the Conference either by submitting formal recommendations, or by asking leave to report more fully twelve months hence to the President of the Conference—such report bearing on its face the names of the Committee, and a statement that the Committee alone is responsible for what it contains.*

In accordance with what we understand to have been the wish of the Conference in appointing a Committee, we have regarded the terms of reference as including not only Brotherhoods and Sisterhoods, but also Deaconesses, and we report accordingly as follows:—

A.

We recognise with thankfulness to Almighty God the manifold tokens of His blessing upon the revival of Religious Communities in our branch of the Church Catholic.

We are thankful, moreover, for the increasing readiness which such Communities have manifested to be brought into closer union with the Episcopate, and to receive counsel from their Bishops.

We desire to secure to Communities all reasonable freedom of organisation and development. Such freedom is essential to the due exercise of special gifts. However important may be the work which is done for the Church by Brotherhoods and Sisterhoods, their primary motive is personal devotion to our Lord; and the

[1] Names of the Members of the Committee:—

Bishop of Albany.
" Bloemfontein.
" Calcutta.
" Christchurch, N.Z.
Bishop in Corea.
Bishop of Fond du Lac.
" Grahamstown.
" Goulburn.
" Lincoln.
" London.
" Marlborough.
Bishop of Oxford (*Chairman*).
" Pennsylvania.
" Quebec.
" Reading (*Secretary*).
" Rockhampton.
" St. Andrew's.
" Vermont.
" Wakefield.
" Washington.
" Winchester.

development of the spiritual life is the power upon which the best active work depends. All liberty, however, must be so regulated as to ensure the maintenance of the Faith, and the order and discipline of the Church, together with a due recognition of family claims and of the rights of individual members of a Community.

It is obvious that such a revival could not but be attended with a certain amount of difficulty and even of danger.

1. Among the points of difficulty not the least serious have been the problems connected with the vows or obligations undertaken by the members of each Community. In view of the fact that we propose to ask the Conference to allow us full time for consultation with Heads of Communities, both of men and of women, we deliberately abstain from entering now into details about such questions as the following:—In what circumstances are these obligations to be regarded as permanent? With what sanction should they be undertaken? By what authority, if any, may dispensation or release be given? We must, however, express our profound sense of the need of care in imposing as well as in undertaking such vows or obligations, and our opinion that there ought in all cases to be some provision, however safeguarded, affording means of release in case of necessity.

2. Every Priest ministering to a religious community should be licensed for that purpose by the Diocesan Bishop.

In the case of Communities of men in Holy Orders care must be taken that there is no interference on the part of the Community with the canonical obedience which each clergyman owes to the Bishop of the Diocese in which he ministers.

3. Right relations to the Episcopate involve some well-defined powers of Visitation; the consideration of what these powers should be, we reserve for our future report.

B.

We hail with thankfulness the revival of the ancient office of Deaconess, and note the increasing recognition of its value to the Church. No full statistical information is at present available as to the progress which has been made, or as to the variety of usage in different branches of our Communion. We have reason to expect that we shall have this information in a complete form before the preparation of our further report. In the meantime, it is our duty to call attention to certain principles, the neglect of which may easily injure and retard an organisation which we believe to be capable, by the blessing of God, of doing incalculable good.

1. Care should be taken to prevent the application, within the limits of our Communion, of the term "Deaconess" to any

women other than one who has, in accordance with primitive usage, been duly set apart to her office by the Bishop himself. Half a century ago, when the official service of women in the Church was unrecognised, the ancient term Deaconess was frequently adopted, both within and without our Communion, as a convenient title by Christian women given to good works, who did not thereby claim any position in the Church similar to that which belonged to the Deaconess of early days. If, however, the revival of the office is to be encouraged and its importance recognised, the accurate use of its title must be carefully guarded.

2. Women thus set apart must first have been carefully trained, and tested as to their fitness for the office, and their purpose to devote their lives to its high calling. There are questions respecting the necessary qualifications for the office, the manner of setting apart a Deaconess, the nature of the specific obligations she assumes, and the form of license she should hold, which will be considered in our subsequent report. It will be necessary to deal also with the question of the rules to be observed when a Deaconess removes to another Diocese from that in which she was set apart.

3. Experience has already shown the possibility and the advantage of encouraging the development of Deaconess life and work upon two somewhat different lines—

(*a*.) The Community life, corresponding more or less closely to that of a Sisterhood whose members are not Deaconesses; and

(*b*.) The system of individual work under the Bishop's licence, without necessary connection with any Community in the stricter sense of the word.

Upon this distinction we ask leave to report more fully hereafter, but we are anxious not to seem to discourage either of two systems, both of which appear to us to have been already blessed of God. It must, however, be understood that, under whatever form of organisation, a Deaconess holds of necessity a direct and personal relation to her Diocesan Bishop.

4. It is, in our opinion, eminently desirable to promote a closer approach to uniformity in the manner of setting apart and licensing Deaconesses in the various Dioceses of our Communion. Upon this point also we hope to speak more fully hereafter.

C.

In matters temporal connected with Religious Communities the following principles should be maintained:—(1) That before Episcopal recognition is given to any Community holding trust property the trust deeds be submitted to and approved by a

competent legal authority appointed by the Bishop, and that the trust deed be such as to secure as far as may be that the property be not diverted from its purpose in connection with the Church. (2) That provision be made for the disposal of property in the event of the dissolution of the Community or the withdrawal of an individual member.

W. Oxon,
Chairman.

No. 3.

Report of the Committee[1] *appointed to consider and report upon the subject of the Critical Study of Holy Scripture.*

I.

The subject of "the Critical Study of Holy Scripture" claims special attention at the present time, inasmuch as some aspects of Biblical criticism, particularly in regard to the origin and structure of the books of the Old Testament, have disquieted the minds of many thoughtful readers of the Bible, whilst others, with an equal reverence for the Bible, welcome free critical inquiry as helping towards a better understanding and readier acceptance of the Word of God.

Your Committee desire in the first place to record their unfaltering conviction that the Divine authority and unique inspiration of the Holy Scriptures cannot be injuriously affected by the reverent and reasonable use of criticism in investigating the structure and composition of the different books. They affirm

[1] Names of the Members of the Committee:—

Bishop of Adelaide.
Bishop Barry.
Bishop of Colombo (*Secretary*)
" Derry.
" Durham.
" Edinburgh.
" Gloucester (*Chairman*).
" Hereford.
" Indiana.
" Kentucky.
Bishop of Maine.
" Manchester.
" Michigan.
" Rochester.
" Salisbury.
Bishop Coadjutor of S. Ohio.
Bishop of Sydney.
" Vermont.
" Wellington.
" Worcester.

that the Bible in historic, moral, and spiritual coherence, presents a Revelation of God, progressively given, and adapted to various ages, until it finds its completion in the Person and teaching and work of the Lord Jesus Christ. This Revelation, as interpreted and applied under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, constitutes the supreme rule and ultimate standard of Christian doctrine.

Your Committee declare, in the next place, their belief that the critical study of every part of the Bible is the plain duty of those Christian teachers and theologians who are capable of undertaking it. At the same time they deprecate all reckless and impatient dogmatism on questions which in many cases await further investigation, and are constantly receiving illustration and correction from new discoveries.

Your Committee, also, record their conviction that such study has produced, not only in recent years, but in the hands of great students of Holy Scripture in former times, and will produce in the future, if diligently and patiently pursued, great gain to the Church, in an increased and more vivid sense of the reality of the Divine Revelation which has been made therein through human agencies and human history, and which contains for us "all things necessary to salvation." It may be added that the well-known results of the critical study of the New Testament Scriptures, perseveringly carried on during our generation, strengthen the expectation that analogous gains will ultimately emerge from the critical studies which are now especially directed to the investigation of the older Scriptures.

Reverence, Patience, Confidence, are the words which may sum up for us the attitude of mind which befits Christian believers in contemplating the subject of "the critical study of Holy Scripture."

II.

Your Committee do not think it within their province to enter into any examination in detail of the various critical speculations now in process of discussion, except so far as to express their conviction that while some are entirely compatible with the principles here laid down, others must be held to be inconsistent with any serious belief in the authority of Holy Scripture; and that, generally, satisfactory results cannot be arrived at without giving due weight to external as well as to internal evidences. They think it well, however, to point out that the study of the Bible during the last fifty years has been necessarily influenced by two characteristics of our age, namely, a development of scientific and historical research, and a clearer recognition of the solidarity of human knowledge. We have been bidden to study

the Bible like any other book, but such study has shown us how absolutely the Bible differs from any other book. We have come to see the significance of the fact, that no authoritative decision on the nature of inspiration has ever been given by the Church; and certainly the significance of the principle, that we have no right to determine by arbitrary presuppositions what must be the character of the records of revelation. We have come to realise, with a new conviction:—

(1.) The variety, the fulness, the continuous growth shown in the Bible, and that it is a Divine Library rather than a single Book.

(2.) The permanent value of the several books of the Old, as well as of the New Testament, when each is placed in its historical environment, and in relation to the ruling ideas of its time.

The progressiveness of Divine Revelation in the various ages covered by the Old Testament Scriptures is an important principle of Biblical study, which has long ago been recognised by genuine students of the Scriptures; but it has had fresh light thrown upon it by the increased endeavours to examine into the age and composition of the different portions of the sacred volume. For many, the process of critical investigation has dissipated certain difficulties, presented by the older historical records; and a careful and sober-minded criticism, as distinguished from criticism of a rash and unduly speculative sort, has proved itself the handmaid of faith and not the parent of doubt.

III.

In speaking of the fruits of this critical study your Committee have naturally dwelt upon the clearer exhibition, due to such criticism, of the general continuity and development of the Revelation of God made in the Bible. They deem it, therefore, the more important to lay emphasis upon the duty, which is unchanged by critical results, of humble and prayerful use of Scripture in its separate parts. The example of our Blessed Lord, and the use of the Old Testament in the New, strongly enforce this duty. Our Lord appeals to the Old Testament as witnessing to Himself. He teaches His disciples that all things written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms concerning Him are to be fulfilled. He dwells, moreover, upon details of type and phrase. He declares that not one jot or tittle shall pass from the Law until all be fulfilled.

Two methods of considering Holy Scripture, the *general* and the *particular*, must go on side by side. They will occasionally overlap; they may sometimes seem to clash. But in this, as in other cases, the course which is most loyal to truth is that of

proceeding confidently upon both lines, without waiting for a theoretically complete reconciliation of the two. The use of the Scriptures by the early teachers of the Church may be regarded as an example to us, of one kind, of the combination of minute fidelity to Holy Writ with great freedom in its treatment.

Your Committee do not hold that a true view of Holy Scripture forecloses any legitimate question about the literary character and literal accuracy of different parts or statements of the Old Testament; but keeping in view the example of Christ and His Apostles, they hold that we should refuse to accept any conclusion which would withdraw any portion of the Bible from the category of "God-inspired" Scripture, "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness."

This Report, it will be seen, does not attempt to make any final pronouncement on critical questions. Your Committee express their conviction with regard to the New Testament that the results of critical study have confirmed the Christian faith. They do not consider that the results of the more recent criticism of the Old Testament can yet be specified with certainty; but they are confident that wherever men humbly and trustfully use the Bible, seeking always the Heavenly assistance of the Holy Ghost, it will commend itself more and more clearly to their hearts and consciences as indeed the Word of God.

C. J. Gloucester,

Chairman.

No. 4.

Report of the Committee[1] *appointed to consider and report upon the subject of Foreign Missions.*

(a) *The duty of the Church to the followers of* :—

(i) *Ethnic Religions.*
(ii) *Judaism.*
(iii) *Islam.*

(b) *Development of Native Churches.*
(c) *Relation of Missionary Bishops and Clergy to Missionary Societies.*

Your Committee heartily thank Almighty God that He has kindled throughout our Communion an increasing zeal for the

[1] Names of the Members of the Committee :—

Bishop of Algoma.
,, Calcutta.
,, Caledonia.
,, California.
Missionary Bishop of Cape Palmas.
Bishop of Christchurch, N.Z.
,, Chota Nagpur.
,, Colombo.
,, Columbia.
Bishop in Corea.
Bishop of Crediton.
,, Down and Connor.
,, Duluth.
,, Durham.
Bishop in East. Equat. Africa.
Bishop of Exeter.
,, Falkland Islands.
,, Jamaica.
Bishop in Jerusalem.
,, Kiu Shiu.
Bishop of Lebombo.
,, Lucknow.
,, Madras.
,, Mauritius.
,, Minnesota.
Bishop Coadjutor of Minnesota.
Bishop of Mississippi.
,, Missouri.
,, Moray and Ross.
,, Moosonee.
Bishop of Newcastle (*Chairman*).
,, Newcastle, N.S.W.
,, New Hampshire.
,, Norwich.
Bishop Oluwole (West. Equat. Africa).
Bishop of Osaka.
Bishop Phillips (West. Equat. Africa).
Bishop of Rangoon.
Bishop Royston.
Archbishop of Rupertsland.
Bishop of St. Andrew's.
,, St. John's, Kaffraria.
Missionary Bishop of Shanghai.
Bishop of Shrewsbury.
,, Sierra Leone.
,, Southampton.
Bishop in South Tokyo.
Bishop of Stepney.
,, Tasmania.
,, Texas.
,, Tinnevelly.
Missionary Bishop of Tokyo.
Bishop of Travancore.
,, Waiapu.
Bishop in Western Equatorial Africa.
Bishop of Wyoming and Idaho.
,, Zanzibar.

extension of the Kingdom of Christ our Lord, and for the salvation of souls, and that He has so abundantly blessed the efforts which have been made—a blessing granted, we doubt not, to encourage us all to far greater labours, prayers, and self-denial. In the last ten years we note especially the great proofs of the regenerating power of the Holy Spirit, and the fitness of the Gospel for all races, which have been displayed in the newly-opened countries of Africa. Yet we see that zeal in this cause is still the enthusiasm of a few, and that the Church has yet to be far more fully aroused to recognise, as a necessary and constant element in the spiritual life of the Body and of each member of it, the fulfilment of our Lord's great commission. Our responsibility in this matter is vast and daily increasing, whether we consider the awful fact that there are still so many of our fellow-men unreached by the Gospel; or consider that so little interest has been taken in the evangelisation of the Jewish race, and that so little systematic effort has been made to win the followers of Islam, although there is abundant encouragement from what has been done, and the opportunities now, especially in India, are unique; or whether we look at the great number of points at which Churches of our Communion are in local contact with heathen nations, or at the responsibilities of the British Empire in India and in the new Protectorates in Africa, or at the great fields ripening for harvest in such regions as China and Japan—China, where Western influence seems to be increasingly welcome, and where there are signs that the blood of martyrs has not been shed in vain; Japan, where, from the characteristic independence of the people, a crisis in the history of the Church seems to be imminent, and to call for the utmost care in the higher Christian education, and the training of those who are to hold office in the Church.

Your Committee have entered with some detail into the matters which have been referred to them, but they desire first to draw attention to some general considerations which cover the whole ground.

The first duty of the Church is intercession. The observance of a special day of intercession in connection with the Festival of St. Andrew appears to have led to a considerable increase in the personal offers for missionary work. Your Committee desire to urge upon the whole Church the urgent duty of making these days of intercession a reality in every Diocese and every parish, and they desire to commend for the general private use the admirable noontide missionary prayers drawn up for the use of the Sister Church of America.

Your Committee observe with gratitude to God that a very large number of students in universities and colleges throughout the world have realised so keenly the call to missionary work that

they have enrolled themselves in a Student Volunteer Missionary Union, and have taken as their watchword "The Evangelisation of the World in this Generation." A large number of these students are members of the Anglican Communion, and it seems the plain duty of that Communion to provide channels through which such newly-awakened zeal may find outlets in earnest, sound, wise work. The time seems ripe for a forward movement in the missionary campaign, and your Committee trust that one result of this Conference will be to give missionary work a far greater prominence than it has yet assumed in the minds of many Churchmen.

Experience has shown the necessity of strong centres of work, the value of community missions, especially in India, the special work of the universities in touching the higher intellectual life of non-Christian nations, the value of the work of women, of medical missionaries, of industrial missions, and the importance of realising the principle, "to him that hath shall be given," if a rich harvest is to be reaped. With the accumulated experience of the last century the Church has now a great opportunity to begin a fresh epoch with greater love for the Master and for the souls for whom He shed His blood, and with greater knowledge, than ever before.

The cause of missions is the cause of our Lord Jesus Christ. May this be our aim, as it will be our highest glory, to be humble instruments in carrying out the loving will of our Heavenly Father; in lowliness of mind, praying for the Divine blessing, and confident in the Divine promises, ministering the Gospel of the Grace of God to the souls that we love; and thus, in promoting the Kingdom of Truth and Righteousness, may we fulfil the sacred mission of the Church of God, by preparing the world for the Second Advent of our Lord.

A. (I.) THE DUTY OF THE CHURCH TO THE FOLLOWERS OF ETHNIC RELIGIONS.

Your Committee have had in view the non-Christian peoples, other than Jews and Mohammedans, in two great groups, those who may be called literate, inasmuch as their creed rests more or less directly on ancient writings, and implies a more or less complete philosophy of life; and the illiterate, whose beliefs and rites are matter of tradition and custom, and are not, as a rule, associated with any instruction in conduct.

We see that Christian zeal for the conversion of the heathen is apt to be dulled, especially in regard to the literate systems, and perhaps in particular to Buddhism, by an exaggerated or false opinion of their excellence. While we thankfully recognise the

work of God the Holy Ghost in many glimpses of truth, theological and moral, which appear in these systems, we are bound to assert, first, that no such system as a whole supplies in any adequate degree the truth about God and about man's relation to Him, or presents any sufficient motive for right conduct, or ministers to man any strength higher than his own to aid his weakness; and, secondly, that, apart from any estimate we may form of such systems, it is a matter of Divine Revelation that in Jesus Christ alone there is salvation for men, that He has been constituted the Saviour and King of mankind, and that to Him are due the loyalty and love of every member of our race. The books in question are known, to all but very few, by extracts only, and a few passages culled from a mass of what is generally puerile, false, or even corrupt and corrupting; they inevitably appear, when translated into language moulded by Christianity, more Christian than they are. Further, such excellent precepts and ideals of conduct as they exhibit are generally vitiated, for those who profess them, by a philosophy, which destroys or paralyses the sense of responsibility.

This appears in the results. These religions have not produced, to any considerable extent, the conduct which they appear calculated to produce; their temples are too often scenes of vice, and the lives of their so-called priests, in some countries at least, too often conspicuous examples of evil. To the mass of the people the contents of their books are almost unknown, unless in the case of certain popular stories, and the practical religion of the masses is unaffected by them. The majority of those who are classed as believers in these literate religions, are worshippers of demons, or of goddesses of small-pox and cholera, and the like; of most it may probably be said with truth, that they have no notion of any supernatural being who is not malignant. Their religion is one of abject fear, not of love or of moral conduct.

Recent attempts to establish in the light of Christianity a purified Hinduism or Buddhism, while they may claim some admiration, cannot be regarded as providing possible substitutes for the Christianity of the Church, based as such schemes are on pantheism or atheism, and denying, as they all do, the Deity of Jesus Christ. Rather they call for our utmost efforts so to establish and equip the visible kingdom of Christ in these lands, that men who are being now detached from the faith of their ancestors may find their home among His people. With this great end in view, while we rejoice over every individual conversion, and recognise as one great spring of missionary enthusiasm the desire to save the souls with whom we are brought in contact, we would urge upon all who are engaged upon this work the paramount importance of building up the Body of Christ, never losing

sight of the great principles of Church order and constitution, and watching with the utmost earnestness over the spiritual growth of those who have been baptised. We offer an earnest caution against the waste of strength in sporadic and unsystematised missions, conducted by some Churchmen apart from the guidance and brotherhood of the Church, whilst we recognise unhesitatingly the loving devotion which deserves to be guided into channels that may permanently enrich the Church of Christ.

Among the illiterate races of the world, those of Africa claim a prominent place. The recent acceptance of Christianity by many tribes of Central Africa constitutes at once an encouragement and an appeal: an encouragement, because of the evidence which is forthcoming of the readiness of the evangelised to become themselves evangelists; an appeal, because of the proof which the acceptance of the truth by these tribes affords of the preparedness of kindred tribes for the preaching of the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

We would emphasise the necessity of stronger efforts to bring to the native races those gifts of God which alone can form in them the character necessary to stand against the present inrush of our civilisation, so deadly to the untaught heathen. The present activity of Mohammedanism makes it the more necessary to enter quickly into the doors which are now open in those lands.

Turning to the methods by which the propagation of the Gospel is effected, we thankfully note a rapid increase in the number of women who are giving themselves to the service of the Missionary Church; a service in which a special and honourable place appears to be reserved, in God's Providence, for such devotion, especially at the present critical point in the Church's growth. Under many forms of national life and custom, it is only by women, that women, on whose influence so much depends, can be reached; and this constitutes a pressing call to the women of our own Communion to offer themselves for this work.

We notice, with like thankfulness, the increased employment of medical missionaries in the mission field, exhibiting as their ministry does the benign character of our Blessed Lord, who went about doing good to the bodies as well as the souls of the people.

Realising the special dangers which arise from isolation and loneliness, we commend the practice of missionary clergy and laymen going forth two by two; and we believe that, under some circumstances, notably in great centres of work among the heathen, there may be special advantages and safeguards in community life.

If we pass, without further remark, the great function of education as a missionary agency, it is only because its importance and value are obvious and undisputed.

We would emphasise the necessity of a closer acquaintance with the smaller details of custom and life of those to whom the missionaries, men and women, are sent; ignorance of which so often causes unknown and unintended, but none the less real, friction between the workers and both converts and heathen.

Above all there is required personal holiness in all who go into these heathen lands from Christian countries. For while our missionaries tell us that the greatest obstacles to their work, on the side of the heathen themselves, are the tyranny of caste without and the paralysing influence of pantheism within, they agree that a greater hindrance still is the inconsistent life of too many professing Christians.

A. (II.) THE DUTY OF THE CHURCH TO THE FOLLOWERS OF JUDAISM.

On the second sub-head, "Judaism," your Committee have to report as follows:—

It is difficult to ascertain the number of Jews by race and religion now in the several parts of the world. The total number is probably less than ten millions. Of these Europe contains about eight millions, America about one million, Africa about 350,000, Asia about 300,000, and Australia about 20,000. These are rough estimates, but they come in the main from a well-informed quarter. Jerusalem is again a city of the Jews, about two-thirds of its total population of 60,000 being Jews; whereas twenty years ago the proportion was trifling.

In England, which contains from 100,000 to 120,000 Jews, they are chiefly congregated in London. Five parishes in the deanery of Spitalfields, with a total population of 56,000, have 34,000 Jews.

In the United States, the largest number of Jews is found in New York. Other cities with large Jewish populations are Cincinnati, Philadelphia, Baltimore, New Orleans, Chicago.

Several agencies exist in connection with the Church for the purpose of evangelising this people, viz., the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews, the Parochial Mission to the Jews' Fund, the East London Mission to the Jews, Jerusalem and the East Mission Fund: and the Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews, in connection with the American Board of Missions.

There are besides other active agencies carried on by other bodies, or of an undenominational character.

The number of these Missions, and their independent action, lead often to an overlapping of their operations, which must be both wasteful and hurtful; and Jewish inquirers are apt to wander from one to another without obtaining lasting benefit from any.

The Evangelisation of the Jewish people is beset with special difficulties.

At the outset we are met with the formidable difficulty of finding duly qualified missionaries. For this work men need to be well acquainted with Jewish modes of thought, and in a large number of cases it is advisable that they should be able to speak in languages with which the Jews are familiar. They have to do with a people who are either strongly imbued with rationalistic views, or deeply attached to their traditional forms drawn, as they hold, from a religion once divinely given.

Again, the consequences of receiving baptism are of the gravest character, the convert being cut off from his family and people as one dead, and cast adrift on the world; severe bodily suffering and loss of goods being sometimes inflicted besides. It is everywhere found that the fear of these terrible results keeps back from baptism many whose life and practice appear to point them out as believers in our Lord; and the necessity of providing in some way for those who have the faith and courage to confess Christ, increases the difficulty of the case.

The evidence at the disposal of your Committee appears to show that the great mass of the poorer Jews know practically nothing of the Old Testament. But it seems clear that the Jews are increasingly willing to listen to Christians who speak to them of the Scriptures of the Old Covenant, and are learning to regard as a great teacher Him who is the theme of the New Testament.

The New Testament, which has been translated into Hebrew and other languages for the use of the Jews, is widely read by them; but the doctrines of the Holy Trinity, and of the Atonement, seem almost insurmountable obstacles in the way of many.

When religious knowledge has spread among the Jews, the breath of the Holy Ghost may come, and the dry bones will live again. Our position with regard to the Jews is specially favourable in this respect, that their Scriptures are our Scriptures, and their God and Father is our God and Father.

It is impossible to doubt that a fairly considerable number of Jews in each year do earnestly and honestly seek baptism, and from such it should not be withheld. But we read the signs of modern times in the ancient prophecies (Isaiah xxvii. 12, Jeremiah iii. 14), "Ye shall be gathered one by one, O ye children of Israel;" "I will take you one of a city, and two of a family, and I will bring you to Zion."

Medical Missions are carried on in many places with much success.

The Anglican Church appears to be fitted in a special manner to gain the goodwill of the Jews, first, because the English-speaking people show themselves just and kindly towards their race; and also because the liturgical services of the Church are

such as to win their attention and admiration, their own worship being of a similar character. The Book of Common Prayer has been translated into Hebrew and circulated among them.

But one of the greatest hindrances which impede the work arises from the strange lack of interest manifested by the Church in the Evangelisation of the Jews. But scant attention is given to their religious needs, and Missions to Jews have shared but little in the rising tide of Evangelistic effort which marks our age.

Yet our Lord gave them precedence, and the Gospel is the power of God for salvation to the Jew first.

Why should not similar zeal be shown for the conversion of the Jew as of the Gentile? Why should the Annual Day of Intercession be held in behalf of the Mohammedan and heathen world only and not also for the salvation of Israel? If this great work were given its true place in the Missionary efforts of the Church we might surely expect that a far richer blessing would descend on her labours than even now is vouchsafed her.

As to the means to be employed, it appears from the evidence that the Jews receive the visits of Gentile Christians more readily than those of Jewish converts to Christianity; while, on the other hand, it is agreed that the latter understand very much better the Jewish mind, and can deal more clearly and effectively with Jewish difficulties. This being so, the Committee can only advise that both agencies should be employed, and that care should be taken to use in each place the kind of agency best adapted to its circumstances.

A. (III.) THE DUTY OF THE CHURCH TO THE FOLLOWERS OF ISLAM.

(A) ISLAM is distinct from both Judaism and heathen Religions, and needs special attention and treatment. Your Committee would base the claims of Islam on the Missionary energy of the Church on the following considerations:—

(1) *The Number and Distribution of Professed Mohammedans.*

The total population of the World is estimated at 1,500,000,000; of these one-seventh are Mohammedans, distributed as follows:—

In Europe	5,750,000
In Asia and the Eastern Archipelago	169,000,000
In Africa	40,000,000
In Australasia	25,000

More than one-fourth of these are citizens of the British Empire, the Mohammedan portion of the population of India alone being

returned at the last census as 57,321,164, and therefore have a special claim on the charity of their more favoured fellow subjects.

(2) *The Character of Islam.*

The amount of truth contained in Islam, such as the doctrine of the Unity, Personality, and Sovereignty of God, and some good habits inculcated, such as the habit of Worship, and Temperance in certain matters, may be used as a foundation on which to build the superstructure of Christian Truth.

(B) With regard to what has been done, and what is now being done, the Committee would call special attention to the inadequacy of our efforts.

Until the present century very little systematic spiritual effort appears to have been made to convert Mohammedans.

As regards the work of the present century there have been the efforts of magnificent pioneers, but we need something more; we need continuous and systematic work such as has been begun in the Diocese of Lahore, and some other parts of India, and which has already borne considerable fruit.

The attention of the Committee has been called to the following special works already undertaken:—

(1) The temporarily suspended work in Constantinople;
(2) The educational and other work in Egypt, Palestine, and the adjacent countries;
(3) The pioneer work in Persia and Arabia;
(4) The work in India, especially in the Punjab, and in Madras;
(5) and last, but not least, the effort of the Bible Societies to circulate the Bible among Mohammedans.

(C) The opportunities of the present time.

Under this head it is to be noticed that—

(1) Never since the Crusades has the attention of Western Christendom been so forcibly directed to Islam and its followers as at present.

(2) The optimistic view of Islam lately held by many Christians has been effectually destroyed by the history of the Armenian massacres.

(3) The toleration which follows in the wake of civilisation generally, and especially in the British Empire, has reduced very considerably the danger to the life and liberty of those who make efforts to convert Mohammedans to Christianity. As has been

pointed out by an eminent writer, India is the place where Christian and Mohammedan can meet most fairly with a prospect of mutual understanding. This rare opportunity involves a corresponding obligation which the Church should not be slow to recognise.

(4) The growth of a spirit of dissatisfaction with Islam is now showing itself among Mohammedans in parts both of Europe and of Asia.

(5) The abolition of the legal status of slavery in parts of Eastern and Western Africa sets slaves free from the necessity of professing the religion of their masters.

(6) Some recent political events in Africa have tended to lower the military prestige of Mohammedanism in that country.

(D) The methods to be employed.

The Committee would call the attention of those concerned in this work to the following points:—

(1) That one of the chief needs of the present time is clear, accurate, reasonable statements of positive Christian truth, especially with regard to the Nature of God, the Holy Trinity in Unity, the Divine Sonship of Christ, the Character of God, the balance of Moral Attributes in God, the essential character of morality, the nature of sin, the need of Atonement and Holiness.

(2) That it is essential that there should be on the part of Missionaries a thorough and patient study of Mohammedanism, also a knowledge of Arabic; that they must show absolute fairness in dealing with the doctrines of Islam, and the character of Mohammed; and that care should be taken not to lose sight of the points of contact between Christianity and Islam, whilst discussing the points of difference.

(3) That Missionaries should, as a rule, not be sent singly, in order to avoid those false charges against their moral character which are a favourite weapon of attack.

(4) That those who undertake this work should, as a rule, be men who have received a special training for it, and should be exclusively set apart for it.

(E) The direction which our efforts might most profitably take.

It is to be noted under this head—

(1) That there are special opportunities for such work at the present time in the Dioceses of Lahore, Lucknow, Eastern and Western Equatorial Africa, and Zanzibar; particularly in the cities of Delhi and Hyderabad, and among the Hausa people of the

Central Sudan. It is very desirable that these districts and places should be effectively occupied.

(2) That more use might be made of such helps as are provided in this country and America and elsewhere, especially by the Indian Institute at Oxford, for the training of men to be employed in such work.

B. DEVELOPMENT OF NATIVE CHURCHES.

In considering the "Development of Native Churches" your Committee have had before them an exceedingly wide and difficult subject, and in seeking to learn the facts have listened to statements about the present condition of the work from Bishops in the countries where the question is of importance, and have also had short summaries of the facts placed before them by the same Bishops.

It seems to them that the method of the development of a native Church is greatly modified by the political and social state of the country in which such a Church is planted, and also by the question whether the native race is one which is already decadent and likely to pass away in the near future, or a race of strong vitality, which is likely to maintain itself, or even to expand.

The subject regarded from the side of race seems naturally to be divided into four heads:—

1. Races diminishing, or that will be absorbed in white races, as the Maoris of New Zealand, and the Indians of North America.
2. Races which will continue numerically vastly in excess, though white races exist among them as a dominant minority, without absorption or amalgamation, as in India, Equatorial Africa, and some of the Pacific Islands.
3. Races wholly distinct and existing side by side, where both are expanding and not amalgamating, as in South Africa.
4. Races independent and likely to work out their own development and to form independent National Churches, as in Japan and China.

Under the first head the facts reported from New Zealand show that while a native ministry exists ministering to the Maoris, it does so under the constitution of the Church and of the Province of New Zealand. There is, therefore, no need for the separate organisation of a Maori Church.

Similar evidence has been given as to the Indians of North America. Though they are vastly more numerous than the tribes of New Zealand, and, perhaps not diminishing markedly in numbers, and though there is among them, as among the Maoris, a native ministry, the facts seem to show that a separate Indian

Church will not permanently maintain itself apart from the Church of the white race.

In India, Africa, Japan, and China, however, though the political and social circumstances are different in each case, we may ultimately expect to see, as the result of missionary labours, autonomous Churches supported and governed in whole or in part by the native races of these countries. As the problem arising in each country is a separate one, and as it is impossible to give in detail all the facts as presented to us, we have tried to summarise in each case the main facts and to indicate where development is evident. In doing this we have had regard to the development of the Church (*a*) in its organisation, and the establishment of a native ministry, (*b*) in self support, (*c*) in spiritual character, and (*d*) in self extension. If, in any case, a Church is developing in all these directions, we ought to have good hope that it will become at no distant day an independent Church, bound to us by no other bonds than the one Faith and one Communion in the Church Catholic.

India.

(*a*) *Organisation.*—The Church in India has attained to a considerable degree of organisation, both by the development of the episcopate, and by the formation of diocesan and other councils; yet it must be admitted that the native portion of the Church has not yet reached an adequate consciousness of corporate life. There are as yet no Bishops of Indian race. So far as pastoral work is concerned, the development of the Indian ministry in most cases keeps pace with the growth of the Christian community. But the number of ordained native missionaries directly engaged in evangelising their own countrymen is small.

(*b*) *Self Support.*—In some parts there has been a marked increase in contributions for religious purposes, but the Church as a whole is very backward in this respect. This is due in part to a mistaken policy in the early development of missions in India.

(*c*) *Spiritual Character.*—There are many earnest and faithful Christians, lay as well as clerical, who, with their families, are lights among the heathen. But it must be acknowledged that too often there is a deficiency in energy, moral courage, and power of initiative; and that caste still grievously exercises its baneful influences. These defects, however, are to a large extent counterbalanced by fruitfulness in the milder graces of gentleness, patience, sobriety, and meekness.

(*d*) *Self Extension.*—With some bright exceptions, especially in parts of Southern India and of Ceylon, there is a want of definite effort for self extension originating in the Church itself.

Africa.

(*a*) *Organisation.*—In Africa, south of the Zambezi the Church possesses a provincial organisation; in Dioceses lying north of the Zambezi, *e.g.*, Equatorial Africa and Sierra Leone, the Churches are still in direct connection with Canterbury, and possess local constitutions approved by the Archbishop of Canterbury. In the Missionary Jurisdiction of Cape Palmas and parts adjacent, which embraces the Republic of Liberia, there is an organisation under the fostering care of the American Episcopal Church and having an African Bishop with full powers at its head and a staff of workers made up almost entirely of Africans. The idea of establishing Churches self-supporting, self-extending, and self-governing, is steadily kept in view. In addition to the Bishop of Cape Palmas of the American Episcopal Church, two African Assistant Bishops have been consecrated in recent years, and have rendered valuable assistance to the Church in the Yoruba Country. The appointment of native Assistant Bishops would appear to be an important step towards the realisation of full native control. In West Africa, and, to a certain extent, in Central Africa, the native clergy commonly hold more or less independent cures; in South Africa they are very seldom placed in positions of entire responsibility. The idea of corporate life needs enforcement to prevent a spirit of congregationalism.

(*b*) *Self Support.*—In South Africa considerable financial support is still received from English Societies. In Zanzibar, with the exception of some voluntary help on the part of the native Christians in building churches, mission houses, etc., the Mission is supported by grants from England. In West Africa, the Churches in Sierra Leone, in Lagos, and in the Delta of the Niger are self-supporting, with the exception of the support of the Bishops; while in the interior, the Churches are aided by annual but diminishing grants. In Liberia the work is almost entirely supported by the American Church; but increasing local contributions are also made towards it. In Uganda, so far as the Native Church is concerned, and apart from the salaries and expenses of the foreign missionaries, the work is entirely independent of extraneous aid.

(*c*) *Spiritual Character.*—In Uganda the standard of Christian life is high—very high as contrasted with the standards of the heathen. In South and West Africa the lives of the Clergy and of many of the laity afford much encouragement and hope as to the future of the African Churches.

(*d*) *Self Extension.*—In Uganda a strong missionary spirit is the distinguishing feature of the Church; in the West of Africa greater missionary vigour is to be desired.

Your Committee would recommend the adoption on the part of the Conference of a resolution expressive of its deep sense of the evils resulting from the present condition of the Drink Traffic on the West Coast of Africa, and of the hindrance which it presents not only to the development of native Churches, but also to the acceptance of Christianity by heathen tribes.

South Pacific Islands.

The Mission of the Anglican Communion in the South Pacific, excluding New Zealand and New Guinea, is confined to Melanesia, and to work in Fiji, not, however, among the Fijians, but among the imported labourers from other islands. In Melanesia the native clergy are about equal in number to the white clergy, and take their place among their white brethren on equal terms. This Mission has distinguished itself by determining to work, as far as possible, through the natives themselves from the very beginning.

Spiritual Character.—A very high level of spiritual character has been developed in almost all the groups included in Melanesia.

Self Extension.—The native ministry, however, is not yet supported by the native Church, but the first steps to attain this object have been taken. The Melanesians have shown marked missionary zeal, as evidenced by the number of teachers and clergy who have been sent to islands inhabited by totally distinct races.

The Committee have heard with thankfulness that the Mission to New Guinea is about to be revived by the Australian Church under the leadership of a Missionary Bishop.

China and Japan.

In China and Japan we meet questions of a different class. Both are the homes of strong and vigorous races, entirely independent of the white races politically, and with a keen sense of nationality.

In Japan, the English and American Missions have united to form one Japanese Church called Nippon Sei Kō Kwai, having its own constitution and canons, though as yet presided over by the English and American Bishops. There is a strong body of Japanese clergy, and self support is being pressed upon the converts, but the prospect of financial independence is still distant. It is, however, only a question of time when the Church in Japan will become self-governing and self-supporting.

The Christians of the Nippon Sei Kō Kwai were drawn chiefly from the middle classes, the highest and lowest strata being as yet very little touched. That the upper classes should come in slowly

and one by one is not surprising, for since their old religions have lost their hold upon them they are very generally agnostics, and their circumstances lead them to look at Christian doctrine in a purely critical and utilitarian spirit. Meanwhile the influence which Christianity exercises on those who do accept it, is seen in the very large extent to which they are to be found in minor posts of public trust, as judges of small districts, heads of local police, etc., where strength and uprightness of character are especially required. Though disappointments are frequent among others, especially as regards purity of life, the Clergy have proved themselves to be men of stability and high Christian character. From the first the Church has recognised its missionary duty, and it has instituted funds, though not on a very large scale, for extension both in Japan itself and in the newly-acquired Island of Formosa.

In China, there is a considerable number of native clergy who are counted by their Bishops most zealous and faithful men, and the number of Christians is steadily increasing, in spite of much persecution and the hostility of the literary and ruling classes. Self support advances slowly owing to the poverty of the people, but is steadily worked for in all the Missions; and the stability of the Chinese character assures us that the work will be permanent, and that a strong Chinese Church will be formed in the future. The first step has been taken this year in the coming together of the English and American Bishops in conference at Shanghai, for union among the various Missions must naturally precede the establishment of a National Church.

Overlapping Episcopal Jurisdiction.

The President of the Conference having referred to the Committee on Foreign Missions a Resolution passed unanimously by the Conference of English and American Bishops held at Shanghai on April 3rd, 1897, in reference to certain questions arising out of overlapping episcopal jurisdiction of independent Churches in full communion with each other, with other documents, including an important communication from the Board of Managers of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the American Episcopal Church, the Committee, having before them the records of the Lambeth Conferences of 1867, 1878, and 1888 (*see* pp. 54, 71, 90, 123, 149), recommend this Conference to adopt the following resolutions :—

Resolved

That this Conference affirms and confirms the following principles :—

(A.) That, while it is the duty of the whole Church to make disciples of all nations, yet, in the discharge of this duty, independent Churches of the Anglican Communion ought to recognise the equal rights of each other when establishing foreign missionary jurisdictions, so that two Bishops of that Communion may not exercise jurisdiction in the same place, and the Conference recommends every Bishop to use his influence in the diocesan and provincial Synods of his particular Church to gain the adhesion of the Synods to these principles, with a view to the framing of canons or resolutions in accord therewith.

(B.) That where such rights have, through inadvertence, been infringed in the past, an adjustment of the respective positions of the Bishops concerned ought to be made by an amicable arrangement between them, with a view to correcting as far as possible the evils arising from such infringement.

(C.) That when any particular Church contemplates creating a new foreign missionary jurisdiction the recommendations contained in Resolution I.[1] of the Conference of 1867 (p. 54) ought always to be followed before any practical steps are taken.

Conclusion.

It will be seen that we have dealt with the matter entrusted to us in its broad outlines without attempting even to mention all the Missions which in an exhaustive review would have claimed our attention, and we express the belief that the problem of the establishment of completely autonomous native Churches, while it is still in process of solution, is being surely worked out by patience, and charity, and apostolic labours.

C. RELATION OF MISSIONARY BISHOPS AND CLERGY TO MISSIONARY SOCIETIES.

Missionary Societies occupy somewhat different positions in the various branches of the Anglican Communion. In the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America the General Convention, being the representative body of the whole Church, is also a Board of Missions, and its executive is a Board of Managers, selected by this Board of Missions. There is also a

[1] The words are as follows :—" That it appears to us expedient, for the purpose of maintaining brotherly inter-communion, that all cases of establishment of new Sees, and appointment of new Bishops, be notified to all Archbishops and Metropolitans, and all Presiding Bishops of the Anglican Communion."

Church Missionary Society which acts as an auxiliary to the Board, assigning its funds to the missionary jurisdiction which it desires to assist, but not claiming to appoint, or assign the several spheres of work to the clergy. The Missionary Bishops, selected by the House of Bishops, appoint their clergy, with the approval of the Board, and assign them spheres of work, reporting to the Board of Managers what they propose to do with the funds appropriated to them. The principle is maintained that those who subscribe the funds have, through their representatives, a substantial voice in the administration of the funds, and this continues until the Diocese is fully organised.

The Missions of the Church of England have been mainly, since the founding of the Societies for Promoting Christian Knowledge and for the Propagation of the Gospel, the special care of societies within the Church, and it was hardly possible that, with a growing Church life and increasing missionary zeal, difficulties should not from time to time arise requiring patient adjustment.

The Committee desire, however, to place on record their conviction—

1. That in the failure of the Church as a whole to realise her bounden duty to be the great Missionary Society of the world, the work could only be done by some of her members forming themselves into societies within the great Society to do what is the work of the entire Church, and that the Church owes to the great societies a debt of deep gratitude for the work which they have been enabled to do.

2. That the increasing life of the Missionary Societies has been the Providential way in which the Church has been gradually realising the truth that the call to evangelise the world was given to the Church as a whole, and that thus the societies have not merely been enabled to do a great evangelising work, but have supplied a Providential stage in leading the whole Church to a higher conception, which has never yet been adequately worked out in Church history.

3. That the societies do not profess to do more than form or found Churches, retiring from the work when the missions pass on to the stage of organised Church life, and that, therefore, any difficulties pertain only to this transitional stage, and vary according to the degree of ripeness which the mission has attained.

These general considerations seem to indicate the point of view from which any difficulties should be regarded—one which should be characterised by gratitude, sympathy, patience, and a firm belief that there are no difficulties which are not capable of friendly adjustment.

It seems impossible to deny the principle that those who subscribe the funds are entitled to a substantial voice in the administration of the funds, subject to the general principles of Church order, or the further principle, that however much it may be desired that donors would generally place their offerings at the disposal of a Church representative body, it is yet legitimate to offer funds for missionary, as for other purposes, impressed by the donor with a special trust, either for special localities, or for the carrying out of such special work, and on such special lines as are consistent with the belief, order, and discipline of the Church.

On the other hand it may be laid down—

1. That clergy in any missionary jurisdiction whatever should be subject to the supervision of a Bishop, and that Societies should use their power and influence in striving to foster a wholesome Diocesan Church life.

2. That the whole object of missionary work being to extend the Master's Kingdom, and to take up fresh ground, as soon as the Church is duly organised in any part of the world, the Society should seek to transfer, as early as possible, to representatives of the Diocese powers which it naturally exercises in early stages of the mission.

3. That as soon as a definite Diocesan organisation has been created with power to hold property, all Church property afterwards acquired should, when possible, be held by such Diocesan authorities, subject to trusts securing the rights or recognising the interests of those concerned.

4. That all questions of internal Church discipline are for the Bishops and Diocesan authorities to deal with.

5. That in the event of the founding of a Theological College for the training of candidates for the Ministry within any Diocese or Missionary jurisdiction, the Bishop of the Diocese or Missionary jurisdiction should be the visitor of the College, to whose arbitration all matters in dispute may be referred.

6. That when Diocesan organisation has covered a given area, *e.g.*, India, the further organisation, provincial or Diocesan, within the area is a matter in which the right of initiative and the general controlling voice must rest with the authorities of the province or Diocese.

EDGAR NEWCASTLE,

Chairman.

No. 5.

Report of the Committee[1] *appointed to consider and report upon the subject of Reformation Movements on the Continent of Europe and elsewhere.*

The Committee feel that the utterances of the last two Lambeth Conferences have so fully stated the attitude of our Communion towards the Reformation movements on the Continent of Europe and elsewhere, as to make its re-statement needless. Founded as they were upon established principles and distinct convictions which cannot change, there is no need to lay again the foundation of the argument, but only to refer to that which has been already laid down.

We have carefully considered, in the light of the latest and fullest information within our reach, the condition of the various movements of Reform; and, for the purpose of greater clearness, take up these considerations generally in the order, and according to the completeness, of their organisation.

(*a*) *The Old Catholic Church in Germany.*

We are justified in expressing our belief that this movement is growing in strength and influence. The very grave loss, which came in the death of their first Bishop, has been in great part made good by the consecration of Bishop Weber, long well known as Professor of Philosophy, who resides at Bonn. It is reported to us as now numbering about 96 congregations, with 56,000 adherents, ministered to by 56 priests.

It has founded, and in part endowed a Theological Seminary at Bonn, in which it is training its own Clergy and also a school for

[1] Names of the Members of the Committee :—

Bishop of Albany (*Chairman*).
" Argyll and the Isles.
" Barrow-in-Furness.
" Chester.
" Chichester.
" Clogher.
" Dover.
" Ely.
" Falkland Islands.
" Gibraltar.
" Honduras.
Bishop Marsden.
Bishop Coadjutor of Minnesota.
Bishop of Ohio.
" Pittsburgh.
" St. Asaph.
" Salisbury.
" Sodor and Man.
" Springfield.
Bishop Coadjutor of Springfield.
Bishop of Stepney.
" Texas.
Bishop T. E. Wilkinson.
Bishop of Worcester.

boys in the same town; and is, we believe, growing in power, from the adhesion and co-operation more and more of women who at first stood aloof, and by the gathering in more and more of children for instruction.

Its last Synod, largely attended, was held on the day after the Consecration at Karlsruhe of the largest and most impressive Church which it has built.

(*b*) *The Christian Catholic Church of Switzerland.*

Whilst not rapidly advancing, because in part at least of difficulties growing out of its relation to the State, this Church, called by a name dear to the people before the Reformation, is holding its own, and deepening its hold.

It has one Bishop, Dr. Eduard Herzog, with 58 Clergymen and about 50,000 adherents. The Church in Lucerne has been consecrated since the last Conference, and is held in joint occupation by the congregations of the Christian Catholic Church in Switzerland, and the Episcopal Church in America.

Recognised as these two Communities have been by the Bishops in Conference in 1888, the Committee has recommended a reassertion of our confidence and sympathy, in a resolution appended to this report.

(*c*) *The Mexican Episcopal Church.*

Much the same thing may be said now about the Mexican Episcopal Church. No longer misunderstood to be a Mission from the Episcopal Church in America to Mexico, it is now fully organised under the Presiding Bishop of the Church in America (who has as his Episcopal Commissary "the Bishop of New Mexico and Arizona"), with its governing Synod, and its liturgical worship entirely in accord with the standards of the English and American "Books of Common Prayer." We recommend that the Conference should thankfully recognise the healthiness of its development, and the hopefulness of its present condition. It has nine priests, all but two of whom are Mexicans, and five Mexican deacons; 27 congregations, with 1,300 adherents, of whom 658 are communicants; 11 parish schools, a school for boys, an orphanage for girls, and a Theological school, all under the immediate care of the Rev. Henry Forrester, an American Priest, representing the Provisional Bishop.

(*d*) *Latin Churches.*

1. *Spain.*—The only other religious reformation movement

having its own Episcopal head, as well as its Synod and its formularies of Worship and Doctrine, is in Spain; it has a Bishop and 10 Clergymen. It is estimated to have 1,170 Communicants, and not less than 3,000 adherents.

2. *Portugal.*—The movement in Portugal, which is closely allied with that in Spain, has five Clergymen, and about 336 Communicants.

3. *Italy.*—The Reformation movement in Italy has its Bishop elect, a Synod, liturgy, ritual, and constitution of its own, with 12 congregations, and is reported to us as having seven Clergymen, and about 1,000 Communicants. Episcopal acts for this community have been discharged from time to time by Bishop Herzog.

4. *France.*—The movement in France is, we understand, now under the Archbishop of Utrecht.

(*e*) *Austria.*

The movement in Austria is distinguished by the great success which has attended it in the part of North Bohemia bordering on Saxony, where its progress has been rapid and sustained. It is estimated to number about 12,000 adherents, and has a Diocesan Administrator who is its Bishop-elect, with eight congregations and eight clergymen.

(*f*) *The Work in Brazil.*

The work in Brazil is on a somewhat different footing from the other movements we have been considering.

It was undertaken by the American Church Missionary Society, which is a recognised auxiliary of the Board of Missions of the Church in America. The Clergy who minister there are under the direction of the Bishops of Virginia and West Virginia. There are many evidences of growth, and of development on the orderly lines of Catholic usage and law. The Bishop of the Falkland Islands, who recently visited the congregations in Brazil, was most favourably impressed by the devotion of the Clergy (seven in number) and the interest of the people, and expresses his belief that the work is good, and is preparing the way for still greater good.

Having regard to the probable spread of these movements of reform, we venture to say that, as a condition for recognition or intercommunion, there should be satisfactory evidence that the Bodies applying are sound and clear as touching the fundamental

verities of the Christian faith, and that the Offices for the administration of the Sacraments are in accord with our own liturgical standards.

WILLIAM CROSWELL DOANE,

Bishop of Albany,

Chairman.

No. 6.

Report of the Committee[1] *appointed to consider and report upon the subject of Church Unity in its relation* (a) *to the Churches of the East;* (b) *to the Latin Communion;* (c) *to other Christian bodies.*

Preamble.

The Committee appointed to consider and report upon the subject of "Church Unity in its Relation to the Churches of the

[1] Names of the Members of the Committee :—

Bishop of Aberdeen.
,, Argyll.
Archbishop of Armagh.
Bishop Barry.
Bishop of Brisbane.
,, California.
,, Carlisle.
,, Colchester.
,, Coventry.
,, Delaware.
,, Dunedin.
,, Fredericton.
,, Georgia.
,, Gibraltar.
,, Glasgow.
,, Jamaica.
Bishop in Jerusalem.
Bishop of Llandaff.
,, London.
,, Marquette.
,, Maryland.
Bishop Coadjutor of Minnesota.
Bishop of Newcastle, N.S.W.
,, North Carolina.
,, Perth.
,, Peterborough.
,, Pittsburgh.
Archbishop of Rupertsland.
Bishop of St. Alban's (*Convener*).
,, St. Andrew's.
,, Sodor and Man.
,, Southwark (*Secretary*).
,, Southwell.
Bishop Coadjutor of Springfield
Bishop of Sydney.
,, Toronto.
,, Trinidad.
,, Truro.
,, Wakefield.
,, Western New York.
Bishop T. E. Wilkinson.
Bishop of Worcester.
Archbishop of York (*Chairman*).

East, to the Latin Communion, and to other Christian Bodies," have thought well to entrust the work to three Sub-Committees for these sections, and to a fourth with special reference to the Scandinavian and Moravian Churches. Their reports as amended by the main Committee are as follows:—

(*a*) ON CHURCHES OF THE EAST.

The Sub-Committee appointed to consider the question of "Church Unity" in its relation "to the Churches of the East," find themselves confronted by a subject so extensive in its range, that they can only hope to deal with it in outline, and to indicate some general principles which it is necessary to bear in mind. They would begin by recalling the reference to this subject which is found in the Encyclical letter of the Lambeth Conference of 1888.[1]

"The Conference has expressed its earnest desire to confirm and to improve the friendly relations which now exist between the Churches of the East and the Anglican Communion. These Churches have well earned the sympathy of Christendom, for through long ages of persecution they have kept alive in many a dark place the light of the Gospel. If that light is here and there feeble or dim, there is all the more reason that we, as we have opportunity, should tend and cherish it; and we need not fear that our offices of brotherly charity, if offered in a right spirit, will not be accepted."

The manifestations of friendly feeling referred to in this passage have been even more remarkable during the intervening period of nine years. It is enough to instance the cordial welcome given to the present Bishop of London[2] when, as Bishop of Peterborough, he attended last year the Coronation of the Czar, and the still more recent demonstrations of brotherly regard which were manifested on the occasion of the late visit of the Archbishop of York to Russia. It is impossible not to see in these events a very hopeful indication of increasing desire on their side, as well as ours, to bring about a clearer understanding and closer relations between these two branches of the Church of Christ. They tend to emphasise and to confirm the numerous expressions of goodwill which have been exchanged during a long course of years between prelates and other ecclesiastics of the Anglican and Eastern Churches. A cordial reception was given by the four Patriarchs of the East to the revival of the Bishopric which represents the Anglican Communion at the Mother-City of Christianity, and this attitude has been constantly maintained, and has been one of uniform goodwill and helpfulness. The Committee do not forget

[1] See above, p. 115. [2] Right Rev. M. Creighton, D.D.

that it is easy to misunderstand and to over-estimate the value of such kindly words and friendly actions. But after every allowance is made, there remains enough to strengthen the hopes and to gladden the hearts of those whose minds are set upon the promoting of closer relations between the Churches of the East and the Anglican Communion.

It is now the duty of the Committee to suggest some of the means by which this good work may be furthered, and, if God will, finally accomplished. One of the difficulties which stand most prominently in the way is the ignorance which prevails on either side as regards the position of the other. With a view to diminish or to remove this hindrance the Committee are of opinion that a systematic effort should be made to bring before the Ecclesiastics of the Eastern Churches in their own tongue the Services of the Anglican Churches, particularly the Office for Holy Communion, along with such other statements of doctrine and of practice as may seem most likely to be helpful; and on the other hand to procure the translation into English of the Liturgies and authorised Catechisms of the Churches of the East. As regards the latter undertaking, the Committee would call attention to the excellent work which has been done during the past thirty-five years, first by the Russo-Greek Committee of the General Convention of the American Church, and afterwards by the Ecclesiastical Relations Commission of the same body, as well as by more than one voluntary Association working in connection with the Church of England.

Your Committee would further suggest the appointment of a Committee, with authority to communicate with the Orthodox Eastern Patriarchs, the "Holy Governing Synod" of the Church of Russia, and the chief authorities of the various Eastern Churches, in order to ascertain how far it may be possible, without sacrifice of principle, to take steps towards the promotion of such closer relations. There is reason to believe that a desire for such action exists on the part of not a few individuals among the Prelates of the Eastern Churches, but it is important to know how far this feeling is shared by the ruling authorities of the Churches themselves. It would be the duty of such a Committee to ascertain by careful inquiry and friendly communication, and by personal conference where possible, how far there is any such desire on the part of the Eastern Churches; and further in what light it would be regarded by the various branches of the Anglican Communion. Those who, on either side, are best acquainted with the important differences which exist between the teachings and customs of the Anglican and the Eastern Churches, will best appreciate the difficulties which appear to stand in the way of their reconciliation; but they will also most hopefully believe that when the origin and the character of these divergences are more accurately understood

many of them will be found to have no authority from the Churches themselves, and others to be not incapable of explanation and adjustment. Many of these divergences have their origin in the different characteristics of oriental thought and expression and in the differences of temperament which distinguish the Eastern nations from those of the West; and similar difficulties may no doubt exist on their side with regard to ourselves. The Committee are thankful to recognise and to bring to the notice of the Conference the great regard and high reverence which are shown to the Word of God in the Orthodox Churches of the East, and the readiness with which they have endeavoured to encourage and to promote the circulation of the Holy Scriptures among the people in their own tongues. Above all, the Committee desire to express their conviction that by united prayer the happy issue will most surely be found, and they rejoice to know that both in East and West there are already a goodly multitude who are offering up such intercessory prayer. In such a matter as this there can be no room for faithless fears among those who truly "believe in the Holy Ghost" and in His willing power to draw together in the bonds of love the divided Members of the Body of Christ.

(*b*) ON THE LATIN COMMUNION.

As regards the Church of Rome, a series of documents has been issued by Pope Leo XIII., expressing his desire for the union of Christendom, but unfortunately asserting as its only basis the recognition of the papal supremacy as of divine right. In the last of these documents the Pope proceeded to an examination of the position of the Church of England, and thus called forth an answer from the Archbishops of the English Church. Though controversy is rarely a method of promoting unity, there are grounds for thankfulness in the courteous tone in which much of this controversy has been conducted; in the abandonment by the Pope of much irrelevant and spurious matter which previously rendered discussion hopeless; in the limitation of the sphere of controversy to definite points; in a large amount of subsidiary literature, embodying the results of much research; and in the desire shown on both sides to understand and not consciously to misrepresent one another. If this spirit increases, even controversy will not have been in vain; and we await the issue of such controversy with entire confidence.

The Committee do not propose to submit any resolution to the Conference on this branch of their subject. They desire to adopt, as the substantial expression of their own opinion, the words of a Committee on Home Reunion of the Lambeth Conference of 1888.

"The Committee with deep regret felt that, under present

conditions, it was useless to consider the question of Reunion with our brethren of the Roman Church, being painfully aware that any proposal for reunion would be entertained by the authorities of that Church only on condition of a complete submission on our part to those claims of absolute authority, and the acceptance of those other errors, both in doctrine and in discipline, against which, in faithfulness to God's Holy Word, and to the true principles of His Church, we have been for three centuries bound to protest." [1]

(c) ON OTHER CHRISTIAN BODIES.

I.

The question of unity with Christian bodies, other than the Eastern and Roman Churches, is one which has awakened among the members of this Conference a deep and most affectionate interest, and has led them to consider once more on what basis such unity might be established.

At the Lambeth Conference of 1888 the following important resolution was passed on the subject:—

That in the opinion of this Conference, the following Articles supply a basis on which approach may be, by God's blessing, made towards Home Reunion:—

(*a*) The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as "containing all things necessary to Salvation," and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith.

(*b*) The Apostles' Creed, as the Baptismal Symbol; and the Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith.

(*c*) The two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution, and of the elements ordained by Him.

(*d*) The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the Unity of His Church.[2]

And now to-day we can only re-affirm this position as expressing all that we can formulate as a basis for conference.

It may be well for us to state why we are unable to concede more.

We believe that we have been Providentially entrusted with our part of the Catholic and Apostolic inheritance bequeathed by our Lord, and that not only for ourselves, but for the millions who speak our language in every land—possibly for humanity at large.

[1] See above, p. 159. [2] See above, p. 122.

Nearly a century ago the Anglican Church might have seemed to many almost entirely insulated, an institution, in Lord Macaulay's language, "almost as purely local as the Court of Common Pleas." Yet at that time an eminent Roman Catholic (Count Joseph de Maistre) declared his conviction that the English Church was endowed with a quality analogous to that possessed by chemical *intermèdes* of combining irreconcilable substances.

This quality of our Church we cannot forget and dare not annul. We feel we should not be justified in placing "new barriers between ourselves and the ancient historical Churches." Nor, in a different direction, do we believe in mere rhetorical calls to unity. Nor would we surrender in return for questionable benefits the very elements of the peculiar strength and attractiveness of our own system—its quiet adherence to truth, its abstinence from needless innovation, its backbone of historical continuity. We cannot barter away any part of our God-given trust, because we feel that such action would involve an amount of future loss and forfeiture which we cannot estimate at the moment.

For these and other reasons we cannot concede any part of our essential principles.

II.

Yet, if this, our inevitable attitude, seems discouraging to many loving hearts, those who are watching for the day of reunion to whiten upon the clouded sky are not without tokens of the coming dawn.

Let us glance for a moment at our four principles.—We rejoice to see—1. The general and loving acceptance of the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as containing all things necessary to Salvation and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith.

2. It is cheering to find that not only the Apostles' Creed but also the Nicene Creed is received by so many holy and gifted minds among our separated brethren. In the Nicene Creed—that lasting safeguard against all forms of speculation which call in question either the perfect manhood or the true Godhead of our Blessed Lord—they acknowledge the essential Christianity necessary for eternal life, more particularly the full truth concerning the person of our Lord Jesus Christ.

3. As to the Two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself: many to whom the question has been referred not only assent to the necessity of the unfailing use of Christ's words of Institution and of the elements appointed by Him; but, in accordance with our Prayer Book, see in the one ordinance the Sacrament of life, in the other the Sacrament of growth.

4. The historic Episcopate not unnaturally raises graver diffi-

culties. Yet in America many of our Presbyterian brethren appear to have been not unwilling to remember that in England in 1660 their forefathers would have been prepared to accept episcopacy with such recognition of the laity as now exists in the United States and in the Irish and many of the colonial Churches. We naturally turn to the Established Church of Scotland, which approached us at the beginning of the present Conference with a greeting so gracious and so tender. That body has amongst its sons not a few who are deeply studying the question of the three Orders in their due and proper relation.

III.

As we approach the conclusion of our task, we wish to advert to two subjects which should stand out high and clear above all else:—(1) The Divine purpose of unity; (2) the existence of conditions in the Church and spiritual world. The first as our authority for working, the second our encouragement to work.

(1) We are thankful that the subject of Christian unity is gaining an increasing hold upon the thoughts, and, we believe, upon the prayers, of Christian people. The day is passed in which men could speak of the Church of God as if it were an aggregate of trading establishments, as if our divisions promoted a generous rivalry, and saved us from apathy and indolence. Men of all schools of thought are realising the grievous injury which has been done to Christianity by the separations which part holy men and women of various Christian bodies from each other.

(2) We find an ever-growing hope of reconciliation in the historical phenomenon of *circumstances* generating a *condition* in the world of thought.

Such *condition-crises* sometimes occur. Their history is this. For a long period, two strains of thought, two currents of opinion, two sets of ideas, exist in a community. Of these, one at the outset is greatly in excess of the other; but that other has in it the true principle of growth, and so at last the two elements stand in equilibrium. Then the balance turns irresistibly, and the hopeless minority of one century becomes the triumphant majority of another. At the present time we are led to believe that this principle may be applied to "Home Reunion."

Circumstances, which are but God's preparation, produce the *condition* which is God's advance. We look forward in faith and hope to the sure coming of a time when this condition will arise by the anti-sectarian and conciliating work of God the Holy Ghost in the life of Christendom.

The *circumstances* of our Christendom are rapidly producing the *condition* which is antagonistic to separation. The circumstances to which we refer are such as these: larger and more liberal

views of the interpretation of Scripture; movements which enlarge and correct men's knowledge of primitive Church history; the overthrow of metaphysical systems which deprave and discolour the attributes of God; belief in and love of the living, ascended Christ, giving earnestness and beauty to Christian worship; thought critical, ethical, æsthetic—these things are bringing about the *condition* in which union will be as natural as disunion has been for some centuries.

In this renewed spirit of unity we trust that our beloved Church will have a large share. We speak as brothers to these Christian brothers who are separated from us. We can assure them that we fail not in love and respect for them. We acknowledge with a full heart the fruits of the Holy Ghost produced by their lives and labours. We remember the fact, so glorious for them, that in evil days they kept up the standard at once of family virtue, and of the life hidden with Christ in God. We can never forget that lessons of holiness and love have been written upon undying pages by members of their communions, and that the lips of many of their teachers have been touched with heavenly fire. We desire to know them better—to join with them in works of charity. We are more than willing to help to prevent needless collisions, or unwise duplication of labour. We know that many among them are praying like many of ourselves, that the time may be near for the fulfilment of our Master's prayer that "they all may be one." Surely in the unseen world there is a pulsation of joy among the redeemed; some mysterious word has gone forth among them that Christ's army still on earth, long broken into fragments by bitter dissensions, is stirred by a divine impulse to regain the loving brotherhood of the Church's youth. May we labour on in the deathless hope that, while in the past, unity without truth has been destructive, and truth without unity feeble, now in our day truth and unity combined may be strong enough to subdue the world to Christ; and the Muse of the Church's history may no longer be hate but love. May He grant us (in Bishop Jeremy Taylor's words) "uniting principles, reconciled hearts, and an external communion in His own good season."

Time ripens, thought softens, love has a tender subtlety of interpretation. Controversy in the past has been too much the grave of Charity. We have much to confess and not a little to learn.

IV.

When we come to consider the practical steps which are to be taken towards reunion, we feel bound to express our conviction as to the magnitude and difficulty of the work which lies before us; a work which can only be accomplished by earnest, and, so far as possible, united, prayer to our Heavenly Father for the help

of the Holy Spirit that we may be delivered from all hatred and prejudice, from everything that can hinder us from seeing His holy will, or prevent us from accomplishing His divine purpose.

The Lambeth Conference of 1888 adopted the following resolution :—

> "That this Conference earnestly requests the constituted authorities of the various branches of our Communion, acting, so far as may be, in concert with one another, to make it known that *they hold themselves in readiness* to enter into brotherly conference (such as that which has already been proposed by the Church in the United States of America) with the representatives of other Christian Communions in the English-speaking races, in order to consider what steps can be taken, either towards corporate reunion, or towards such relations as may prepare the way for fuller organic unity hereafter." [1]

We consider, however, that the time has now arrived in which the constituted authorities of the various branches of our Communion should not merely make it known that they hold themselves in readiness to enter into brotherly conference with representatives of other Christian communities in the English-speaking races, but should themselves *originate such conferences and especially arrange for representative meetings for united humiliation and intercession.*

ON THE MORAVIAN CHURCH.

Your Committee find that the last Lambeth Conference expressed themselves in regard to the *Unitas Fratrum* in the following resolution :—

> "That having regard to the fact that the question of the relation of the Anglican Church to the *Unitas Fratrum*, or Moravians, was remitted by the last Lambeth Conference (of 1878) to a Committee, which has hitherto presented no Report on the subject, the Archbishop of Canterbury be requested to appoint a Committee of Bishops, who shall be empowered to confer with learned theologians, and with the heads of the *Unitas Fratrum*, and shall report to His Grace before the end of the current year, and that His Grace be requested to take such action on their Report as he shall deem right." [2]

The Committee appointed in accordance with this request collected some valuable materials for a report, which were informally laid before the late Archbishop of Canterbury.

[1] See above, p. 122. [2] See above, p. 123.

Your Committee are of opinion that on some questions involved further investigation and consideration are desirable, and they therefore deprecate any pronouncement at the present time upon the question of Moravian Orders.

Your Committee find that very friendly relations exist at the present time between the *Unitas Fratrum* and the members of the Anglican Church in contact with them, and that their missionary efforts, their zeal for education, and their Christian spirit are held in high esteem. The good and unobtrusive work that they have done and are doing in the mission field, their excellent methods and discipline, and their consistently unaggressive attitude, have especially endeared them to those Bishops of our Communion whose sphere of labour lies outside England. It is, therefore, obviously a matter of expediency as well as of duty to bridge over or remove the obstacles which at present separate the two Communions.

Your Committee accordingly submit to the Conference two resolutions which will, they trust, if accepted, conduce to this most desirable end.[1]

ON THE SCANDINAVIAN CHURCH.

The last Lambeth Conference desired, "That earnest efforts should be made to establish more friendly relations between the Scandinavian and Anglican Churches; and that approaches on the part of the Swedish Church, with a view to the mutual explanation of differences, be most gladly welcomed, in order to the ultimate establishment, if possible, of inter-communion on sound principles of Ecclesiastical polity." Your Sub-Committee have to report that no advances of the character hoped by the last Conference have been made by the Church of Sweden. It still remains for the present Conference to consider in what way "earnest efforts can be made to establish more friendly relations between the Scandinavian and Anglican Churches."

Those Members of this Committee who have been most concerned in this question, either as having visited Sweden in this interest, or as being most closely in contact with Swedes in America, do not represent any desire for nearer approach to be apparent on the part of the Church of Sweden, which seems to exhibit indifference on the subject. The practical urgency of the question of closer union can only be measured by those Bishops who, chiefly in certain districts of America, have large bodies of Swedish settlers in their Dioceses, and to whom it is a pressing problem to determine upon what condition they may be able to take Episcopal charge of those settlements.

In regard to these settlements your Committee are informed

[1] See above, p. 206.

that it is incorrect to speak as if there were a Church of Sweden in America. The Swedish immigrants come as individual settlers, and are not organised with Pastors from Sweden as congregations connected with the Church of Sweden, but, where they form Swedish congregations, do so as members of the non-Episcopal body called the Augustana Synod. Their proclivities are as much towards other non-Episcopal bodies as towards the American Church. Those who become members of the American Church do so from personal preference for it among the religious bodies which they find in the country, not as members of a Church in recognised communion with it. Swedish students have been ordained as clergy of the American Church, but simply as other students are, and on the same qualifications. Swedish Orders are not accepted for ministrations in American congregations. It may be well here to refer to the Report presented to the General Convention in 1895 by a Joint Commission on Swedish Orders, although it was not adopted by the Convention. That report concluded with this Resolution: "That (while not giving any judgment with regard to the validity or otherwise of ordinations ministered by the Established Church of Sweden, for the reason that the subject is now before the Lambeth Conference) for the greater security of our own people, this General Convention judges it right that without first receiving the Order of Deacon, and afterwards that of Priesthood, with the undoubtedly sufficient form of words provided by our Prayer Book, and from a Bishop in communion with this Church, no Minister of the Swedish Church shall be allowed to officiate in any Congregation under the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction of the Protestant Episcopal Church."

Though not adopted by the Convention, this represents the existing practice; and the reasons on which the Joint Commission based their proposed Resolution, may furnish a convenient summary of the defects alleged by those not satisfied as to the validity of Swedish Ordinations. The Lambeth Conference may judge that the propriety of invitations to the Church of Sweden, or of efforts to promote mutual explanations with a view to establishing intercommunion with that Church, may depend upon the probability of the Conference itself being satisfied of that validity. On this ground your Committee present the positions asserted in the Report of the American Joint Commission to their General Convention.

"1. They find that there is a very strong probability that in the Established Church of Sweden a tactual ministerial succession has been continued since the time of the Lutheran Reformation.

"2. They also find that since that time the Swedish Church has not retained the three orders of the Ministry, the Diaconate, as a Holy Order, being entirely rejected.

"3. They further find that at Swedish Ordinations the laying

on of hands is accompanied by no words denoting the conferring of any gift, order, or office, nor by any prayer for the descent of the Holy Ghost. The only words now used, and this has been the unvarying custom since 1571, are the Lord's Prayer.

"4. They also find that the same ceremony of laying on of hands and the same words are used at the 'Ordination to the office of Preaching,' at 'the Installing into the office of Church Pastor,' and at 'the Installing of a Bishop into Office.'

"5. They also find that while 'Ordination' or 'Consecration' to the Episcopate is sometimes spoken of in the Canon Law, in the present office books there is no such Service, but only one for 'Installing a Bishop into Office,' which corresponds almost exactly with the form for 'Installing a Church Pastor into Office.'

"Your Joint Commission could add other facts, but they deem these sufficient to warrant their proposing the resolution (as given above)."

In the face of the careful study on which the Joint Commission assures the Convention that their report is based, this Committee (while observing that the Convention did not adopt the report, but continued the Commission and postponed further consideration until the next General Convention) express their respectful hope that further examination of the facts may be pursued on behalf of the Lambeth Conference.[1]

It is not the office of this Committee to argue the large ultimate question, what is the measure of essential adequacy of form to be required by one Church of another Church, as the condition of intercommunion? whether, for example, the essential adequacy be in the intention of the whole office, or in a particular verbal expression or formula; whether the Lord's Prayer can be offered with special and sufficient intention; whether recitation of Scripture enjoining the function be sufficient expression, or such recitals must be turned into formal prayers; whether such prayers must be offered individually by the Consecrators or Ordainers, or may be offered by the whole assembled congregation; whether such prayers must be said absolutely during the continuance of the act of imposition of hands, or may conclude and combine into one functional action a series of ceremonial emblems of the office to be conferred; whether any particular order of prayers and acts be essential; and chiefly whether complete enumeration of all functions assigned to an office by one Church is to be required of others in exact identity. These, and like general questions of principle, on which ultimate judgment about the validity of Ordinations may be held to depend, are questions for the Conference itself.

But the Committee having presented above the arguments of the American Joint Commission, think it only fair to supplement them with these remarks upon the facts.

[1] See above, p 206, Resolution 39.

1. The one object of King Gustavus Vasa in his dealing with the Pope was to secure a valid National Episcopate.

2. The first Archbishop of Upsala consecrated after the Reformation, for the transmission of Apostolical Succession, laid down, in an ordinance made law at the Synod of Upsala in 1572, that a Bishop should be regularly elected, that his Election should be confirmed by the State, and *that he must receive Episcopal Consecration.*

The Preface of the Swedish Prayer Book asserts that while the Prayer Book has been revised at each interval of a century, this revision has not been made for change of doctrine or custom, but to meet advances in culture, and that the teaching is the same as at the first.

The chief anti-Lutheran National historians hold it beyond dispute that orders were transmitted by consecration to the succession of Swedish Bishops.

In interpreting the office book, this original intention and historical recognition must be taken into account.

3. Comparison of the offices for installing a Bishop and a Pastor brings out essential differences of more importance than the mere likeness of phrase used in speaking of a Bishop as set in an office. The Pastors' institution may be conducted by Priest or Provost, and is not an Episcopal function. The Pastor is called "*Introducendus*," not "*Ordinandus*." No emblems or instruments are given him, nor is the *Veni Creator* used. His office is not referred to Divine institution, nor does the Installer speak of acting on behalf of God. The Lections are varied from those at Ordinations, though some are the same. These differences in the character of Instalment; in the title of the Installed; in the intentions expressed in the Lections; and in the delivery of emblems or instruments, as well as in the questions asked and in the Invocation of the Holy Ghost; may be held by Swedes to constitute the same difference between the Swedish offices for Bishop and Pastor, as exists between our services for Consecration and Institution.

4. The salient points of agreement between the two Swedish offices are: (1) That in both offices the Bishop and Pastor are set—the one in a particular see, the other in a particular parish. (2) That the only prayer offered during the actual imposition of hands is the Lord's Prayer. But here again, in the Bishop's case, the culminating emblem of setting the mitre on his head is all that intervenes between the imposition of hands and the following special prayer, almost identical with that in the Anglican Ordinal:—

"We thank Thee, Almighty God, Merciful Father, that Thou of Thine infinite kindness hast given us Thy only begotten Son Jesus Christ to be our Saviour; who, after He had redeemed us

by His death, ascended over all heavens, hath richly poured out His gifts upon mankind, and, for the upbuilding of His Church, set some to be Apostles, some Prophets, some Evangelists, and some pastors and teachers; we pray Thee, grant this Thy servant, who is now set to have oversight in the Church, Thine Holy Spirit, that he may always be ready to work for the gospel of peace, and so use the office which is given, that he may not pull down but build up, not harm but help. Let him not neglect the gift that is in him but hold to prayer, to establish Thy word, to read, warn, and teach. Let him in all things show himself to be Thy servant so that he, as a faithful and ready steward, may feed Thy household in due season, and at the last may receive eternal joy—through Jesus Christ, etc."

The service implies, as distinctly as our own ordinal, a lifelong office, resting on gifts and containing duties which are the same in both ordinals.

5. The office for the second Order of Ministry is criticised by the American Commission only upon the general point already dealt with, viz., that the Lord's Prayer is the only prayer during the actual imposition of hands. The name of this Order has caused misapprehension. The Preacher-Office (which might be rendered the Prophetic Office) is to be interpreted by the intention expressed in the Lections in which the ordained is directed to see the idea of his office, and which include John xx. 21–23; and further expressed in the questions which inquire not only about teaching, but about the ministry of the Sacraments according to Christ's institution. The action of imposition of hands is supplemented by the investing with the chasuble. The terms employed about the office speak expressly of it as Ordination; and its contents, if varied in order, agree very closely with the Anglican Ordinal.

6. The Diaconate holds a place like that of a Lay Reader in the Anglican Church.

This Committee do not embody the Swedish Ordinal in their Report, because there is variation in the translations available, and in editions of the Swedish books themselves, and this in important technical terms. They think that it should be a step preliminary to an expression of any judgment about the Swedish Ordinal, that a complete and authoritative translation of it be made.

It is upon the general principles affecting the essential adequacy of that Ordinal that the validity of the Swedish Orders has to be considered.

No question appears to be raised as to what the American Commission calls a "tactual ministerial succession," of which it allows a very strong probability that no break of continuity has occurred since the Reformation. Its beginning may be very shortly stated from the manuals available, which, if the statements are verified,

establish that "the Apostolic Succession was received by Peter Magnusson, consecrated at Rome in 1524 to be Bishop of Westeras, and was conveyed by him to several Bishops by consecration, who in like manner transmitted Roman orders to their successors in the Swedish Church." The said consecration of Magnusson at Rome is certified by a letter of Clement VII. to Gustavus; by a letter of the Papal Prothonotary to the Archbishop of Trondhjem; by records at his Monastery of Wadstena, of his visit as Bishop and his death as Bishop; by his admission as Bishop to the State Council; and by accounts in three co-temporary Episcopal Chronicles. In 1528, before Gustavus in 1529 rejected the Roman supremacy, Magnusson consecrated three Bishops in view of the King's Coronation. In 1531 he consecrated Peterson as the first Archbishop of Upsala after the supremacy of Rome was rejected, and three other Bishops with a view to the King's marriage. Archbishop Peterson made in the Synod of Upsala in 1572 the provision above noticed for perpetuating Episcopal Consecration for the Episcopal Succession.

To return to the practical problem before your Committee. The Bishops most nearly concerned with Swedish settlements have to determine what Ecclesiastical relations with them would be legitimate. The question is two-fold—as it affects Swedish laity, and as it affects Swedish Clergy. Can they accept Swedish Confirmation, and admit lay Swedes to communicate in Churches under their jurisdiction? Can they admit Swedish Clergy to minister in those Churches? In face of their belief that the Swedish Church authorities are indifferent about intercommunion, and seeing that congregations of the settlers are rarely in charge of Swedish Episcopal Clergy, and feeling that members of these non-episcopal bodies must and can be dealt with by reception into the American Church, the American Bishops do not press for any hasty change in the present position, which they think possible to work on for some time towards gradual amalgamation; at the same time they desire a step forward to be made. They suggest that the first step might most wisely be taken by making personal approaches to the Swedish Bishops most interested in the subject, with a view to learning the disposition of the Swedish Church for any communication about it.

Signed,

WILLELM: EBOR:

Chairman.

No. 7.

Report of the Committee[1] *appointed to consider and report upon the subject of International Arbitration.*

In presenting their Report, your Committee desire to express their sense of the importance of the subject entrusted to their consideration. They have avoided all reference to ancient theories, and have dealt as far as they have been able with the more practical aspects of the question.

Interdependence of Nations.

The horrors of war and the blessings of peace are admitted, but the probable magnitude of any future war is hardly realised. In the first 14 days of the Franco-German War, when the combatants engaged can hardly have reached a million, 50,000 men are said to have fallen. Now, however, it has been calculated that, in the event of European war, there would probably be as many as 20,000,000 armed men placed in the field. None can contemplate the slaughter which such a war would necessitate without yearning for well-founded peace. Whilst the knowledge of these gigantic forces may make nations reluctant to embark on war, there are, nevertheless, conditions which tend to promote it. The intense feeling of nationality; the growing sense of race interests; the pressure which, owing to increasing population, is felt by some European nations—are causes which may make war inevitable. With these may be reckoned the influence of popular excitement, stimulated by the telegraph and the press, and not wholly unaffected by the manipulation of speculators on the bourses and stock exchanges, and by the unscrupulous arts of self-seeking politicians. In moments of excitement peoples may be more

[1] Names of the Members of the Committee:—

Bishop of Ballarat.
" Cashel.
" Chichester.
" Colorado.
" Huron.
" Kansas.
" Lichfield.
" Marlborough.
" Massachusetts.
" Newark.
Bishop of Newfoundland.
" New York.
" North Queensland.
" Pretoria.
" Ripon (*Chairman*).
" Swansea.
" Washington.
" Western New York.
" Western Texas.

ardent than reasonable, and may be plunged into war before they are aware of it. Within our own generation we have had examples of this danger. We have had in the heated public feeling aroused by comparatively insignificant incidents witness and warning of the difficulty of controlling the impulses of an excited people.

Notwithstanding this, at no period of the world has it been easier to realise the miseries inevitable to war. We recognise more and more the interdependence of nations. The deepest thinkers assure us that it is a fiction to believe that the prosperity of one nation is promoted by the adversity of another. Casual, transitory, or fictitious gains may arise to particular interests or trades in consequence of war, but the terrible dislocation of commercial intercourse and trade arrangements far outweighs any such gain. As civilisation grows, the sense of this dependence of nation upon nation must increase. Some peoples are dependent for their food, others for their wealth, and all more or less for their comfort, on one another. Sixty per cent. of the exports of the United States come to England; 33 per cent. of their imports come from England; this means a commercial intercourse of a magnitude which is little appreciated, but the dislocation and divergence of which through war would bring ruin to millions, and untold misery to the working classes who would be the first to suffer. In realising this interdependence of nations we can appreciate the force of the words of that great modern soldier, General Moltke, "Every war, even for the nation that conquers, is nothing less than a misfortune." This misfortune touches far more than material interests: Art, Literature, and Science have joined with commerce in binding nation to nation. War strikes at the heart of the higher interests of mankind.

Your Committee are far from urging peace simply for prudential reasons. It is no part of their duty to declare that there have not been in the past or that in the future there may not be occasions when some great principle must be fought for. But under any circumstances before the decision of war is invoked, it appears to them to be the solemn duty of the people to make sure that it is a great principle and not a prejudice or object of pride which is at stake, and to reflect that great principles may often be more effectively maintained by reasoning, fair dealing, and patience, than by war. In an age when differences between individuals are settled by the Courts, and by a regard for justice, it is reasonable to hope that by similar methods serious differences between nations may be decided.

Indications of Popular Feeling.

As an indication of the growth of popular feeling on the subject, your Committee may notice the number of voluntary societies

which have been established within the present century. No less than six peace societies exist: the English Society, dating from 1816; the American, 1826; the Swiss, 1830; the French, 1841; followed in 1882 and 1883 by the Danish and Norwegian Societies. But societies like these, which may be thought to be somewhat ideal, have of recent years given way, more or less, to societies established for the distinct purpose of advocating the principles of Arbitration. Of these, the English Society, 1882, and the Swedish Society, 1883, were followed by the French Society of 1889, which is the result of the fusion of two previous similar societies. In the United States an important organisation has recently come into existence. There are also societies which have been described as socialistic, which are mainly working men's societies for the promotion of peaceful relationships between nations. An English society was established in 1875, and a French society twelve years later. But besides these national societies, there are three international societies, "The International League of Peace and Liberty," 1867; "The Institute of National Rights," having for its aim the consideration of international law, and its codification, arbitration, and the insertion of arbitration clauses in treaties; and thirdly, the association for the "Reform and Codification of the Rights of Nations," 1873. These and kindred societies, whatever may be thought of their individual characteristics and methods, are indications of a growing popular feeling in favour of the peaceful solution of international difficulties. The establishment of the more recent "Entente Cordiale," which will be in the recollection of many of us, is only another sign of the same state of feeling.

Parliamentary Action.

Your Committee notice with pleasure the progress which has been made in bringing the question of International Arbitration before the Legislatures of different countries. Within two years, 1873–75, resolutions in favour of International Arbitration in one form or another were passed by the Legislatures of England, Italy, Sweden, the United States, Holland, and Belgium. Similar resolutions, in even more recent years, have been brought forward. In 1888 a petition, signed by 6,000 citizens, advocating permanent arbitration between the Scandinavian States, was presented to the Danish Parliament, May, 1888. In October, 1890, the Assembly carried by a majority of fifty-eight to ten a motion not only advocating arbitration between the Scandinavian States, but pressing for negotiations for the establishment of the principle with other nations. In the same year a similar vote was passed in the Parliaments of Norway and Spain; and the Italian Parliament authorised the Government to conclude treaties of arbitration with

all the Powers. Such movements are enough to justify the words of Lord Salisbury in his speech at Hastings in 1892: "We have got rid of private war between small magnates and smaller magnates in this country: we have got rid of duelling between man and man: we are slowly, as far as we can, substituting arbitration for struggling in international disputes."

Arbitration in Practice.

In practice, the principle of arbitration has been increasingly recognised in recent years. Between 1820 and 1830 there were only three cases of international dispute submitted to arbitration. Between 1880 and 1890 there were no fewer than 21. The average number of cases per decade between 1820 and 1850 was four; between 1850 and 1890 it was between 15 and 16. It is true that the majority of these cases have been on matters of minor importance, but that matters of first-rate importance have not been excluded is proved by the cases of the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg, of Crete, and of the Alabama Claims.

The Committee desire to call attention, moreover, to the fact that the majority of instances in which arbitration has been invoked have been cases more or less touching commercial interests. Parallel to this is the almost automatic action of maritime laws (practically arbitration principles) which govern the Prize Courts.

When it is remembered that the commercial interests of nations are their practical interests, and that political questions are seldom strong enough to lead nations to forget them, it will be seen how large a proportion of pressing human affairs may be brought under the principle of arbitration. It has been proved that nations are not averse to employ it in matters not affecting such vital interests as their existence, their independence, or their integrity. It can no longer be said, therefore, that arbitration is an untried method.

The habit, moreover, of appealing to arbitration calls a halt to the roused passions of men, and gives pause to hasty action. It allows men time to think, and the second thoughts of nations, as of men, are usually the best and wisest thoughts.

Arbitration Methods.

Your Committee deem that it is no part of their duty to recommend methods of arbitration, or to suggest the rules or principles on which Courts of Arbitration may be formed. They fear, however, that a permanent International Tribunal for all nations can hardly be looked upon as within the sphere of practical possibilities. Nations would view such a tribunal with suspicion. It

could hardly have the power to enforce its decisions, and if it had, the enforcement of its decisions would mean war. They look with more hope to the practice of contracting Arbitration treaties between nations, leading to the creation of a temporary court mutually agreed upon, and to the establishment of Arbitration Commissions specially constituted for the occasion, and voluntarily accepted. In this way the impartiality, which is essential to the success of such efforts, would be more likely to be secured than could be possible in a permanent international court. They look, with still more hope, to the growing practice of inserting arbitration clauses in international treaties; seeing that arbitration can be most successfully used in matters touching facts, and in the interpretation of admitted documents like treaties.

They desire also to express their opinion that the cause of international peace is not promoted by those who indulge in theories and visions, even though those theories are dignified by the name of "Laws of Nature." They believe that in matters of this kind, it is as dangerous to awaken false hopes as it is to repress the growing sentiment of mankind in the direction of a better state of things. Far better than enlarging on doubtful theories is to put forward facts, and to give prominence to those precedents which do so much to stimulate the conscience and establish the confidence of mankind in the growth of good.

Public Opinion.

While your Committee would hesitate to pronounce war, *per se*, to be immoral, as some have done, they cannot but feel that there are deep moral principles involved in the subject. Philosophers have recognised this. In Germany, Kant and Hegel; in France, Auguste Comte; in England, Jeremy Bentham, James Mill, and John Stuart Mill have written in this sense. In the judgment of the Committee, therefore, the best work which the Christian Church can do in this matter is to foster the Christian moral sense of public opinion. It should seek to familiarise peoples with the idea of arbitration, and to impress upon them that there is another mode of settling disputes than the appeal to the sword. Much good may be done by calling attention to the literature of peace. Children are familiarised with the glories of war; they are not so often made familiar with the less obtrusive, but not less noble heroisms of peace. It would seem to be the part, therefore, of all Christian people to keep steadily before their own minds, and to aid in keeping before the minds of others, a better ideal of international intercourse. Christianity encouraged the nobler aspects of patriotism, but Christianity certainly proclaims the brotherhood of man. The Roman Emperor Marcus Aurelius said, "As I am Antoninus, I am a citizen of Rome; as I am a man, I

am a citizen of the world." The followers of Christ can say no less than the philosopher king. They should say much more who believe that God hath made of one blood every nation of men, for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and who believe that Our Lord Jesus Christ was an Ambassador of peace.

The Christian Temper.

One consideration more the Committee desire to press upon the Conference. In their judgment indirect means are often more powerful than direct, and the cause of international amity may be promoted in other ways than the popular advocacy of international arbitration and friendly treaties. War depends much more on the temper of peoples than on the theories current at any particular epoch. They would, therefore, urge upon the Conference the duty of reminding their fellow Christians throughout the world that the interests of mankind and the peace of the world are likely to be subserved more by the cultivation of a Christian temper than by the promulgation of theories, however excellent. To promote impartiality of judgment; thoughtfulness and deliberation in action; a judicial calmness in moments of popular excitement; a charitable way of looking at all questions; and a faith in the honour and good intentions of other nations—in other words, to make the sense of righteousness, quietness, and brotherliness really operative in the lives of men is to do more towards peace than compiling volumes or theorising about the laws of nations. It is thus that public opinion—called by some the greatest of powers in these last days—may be directed towards nobler ideals, and by this means the true victory of Christian principles may be accomplished.

W. R. Ripon,

Chairman.

Appendix.

The Committee think it may be useful to append a list of some works bearing on the subject of International Arbitration. The works of Grotius, "Rights of War and Peace"; of Puffendorf, "Law and Nature of Nations"; and Vatel on the "Law of Nations" are too well known to need more than mentioning.

Among more modern works are—

Rouard De Card, E: "L'Arbitrage International dans le Passé, le Présent et l'Avenir." Paris, 1877.

Rouard De Card, E.: "Les Destinées de l'Arbitrage International." Paris, 1892.

Kamarowsky: "Le Tribunal International." Translated from the Russian by Serge de Westman. Paris, 1887.
Dreyfus, F. C.: "L'Arbitrage International," with Preface by F. Passy. Paris, 1892.
Revon, Michel: "L'Arbitrage International, son Passé, son Présent et son Avenir." Paris, 1892.
Laveleye, Emile de: "Des Causes Actuelles de la Guerre en Europe et de l'Arbitrage." Brussels, 1873.
[Moore, J. B.[1]]: "International Arbitration, Historical Notes, etc." 1896.
Seebohm, Fred: "On International Reform." 1871.
Lorimer, Prof.: "The Institutes of Law."
Amos, Prof. Sheldon: "Lectures on International Law."
Amos, Prof. Sheldon: "Political and Legal Remedies for War."
Westlake, Prof.: "The Principles of International Law."
Holtzendorff, —: "Handbuch des Völkerrechts." 1889.
Holtzendorff, —: "Encyclopädie der Rechtswissenschaft (Art. Schiedsspruch)." 1881.
Balch, T. W.: "International Courts of Arbitration, Philadelphia." 1896.
Calvo, C.: "Manuel de Droit International," §§ 1489–1510. Paris, 1887–88.
Bluntschli, —: "Das Moderne Völkerrecht der Civilisirten Staten als Rechtsbuch dargestellt." § 448.
Rivier, A.: "Principes du droit des gens." Paris, 1896.

Attention should also be called to Professor Holland's Lecture on the Brussels Conference of 1874 (London, 1876), and to the interesting articles in the *Forum* of July and October, 1896, the former by President Eliot, of Harvard University, the latter by Lord Russell of Killowen, being the admirable address given by the Lord Chief Justice before the American Bar Association, and also to an article in the *Atlantic Monthly*, by Hon. E. J. Phelps, of July, 1896.

[1] Mr. Moore was entrusted by a vote of Congress with the duty of preparing a history and digest of Arbitrations to which the United States have been parties.

No. 8.

Report of the Committee[1] *appointed to consider and report upon the Office of the Church with respect to Industrial Problems*—(a) *the Unemployed;* (b) *Industrial Co-operation.*

I.

The Committee desire to begin their Report with words of thankful recognition that throughout the Church of Christ, and not least in the Churches of our own Communion, there has been a marked increase of solicitude about the problems of industrial and social life, and of sympathy with the struggles, sufferings, responsibilities, and anxieties, which those problems involve.

They hope that they rightly discern in this some increasing reflection in modern shape of the likeness of the Lord, in whose Blessed Life zeal for the souls and sympathy for the bodily needs of men were undivided fruits of a single Love.

The Committee, before proceeding to touch upon two specific parts of the subject, desire to record briefly what they deem to be certain principles of Christian duty in such matters.

The primary duty of the Church, as such, and, within her, of the Clergy, is that of ministry to men in the things of character, conscience, and faith. In doing this, she also does her greatest social duty. Character in the citizen is the first social need; character, with its securities in a candid, enlightened, and vigorous conscience, and a strong faith in goodness and in God. The Church owes this duty to all classes alike. Nothing must be allowed to distract her from it, or needlessly to impede or prejudice

[1] Names of the Members of the Committee :—

Bishop of Barrow.
" Beverley.
" Brisbane.
" California.
" Chichester.
" Christchurch, N.Z.
Bishop Cramer Roberts.
Bishop of Durham.
" Hereford (*Chairman*).
" Lexington.
" Lichfield.
" Los Angeles.
Bishop Coadjutor of Minnesota.
Bishop of Mississippi.
" Newcastle, N.S.W.
Bishop of New Westminster.
" Nova Scotia.
" Ohio.
" Perth.
" Qu'Appelle.
" Quebec.
" Rochester.
" Richmond.
" Shrewsbury.
" South Florida.
" Stepney.
" Thetford.
" Washington (*Secretary*).
" Western Missouri.

her in its discharge, and this requires of the Clergy, as spiritual officers, the exercise of great discretion in any attempt to bring within their sphere work of a more distinctively social kind.

But while this cannot be too strongly said, it is not the whole truth. Character is influenced at every point by social conditions, and active conscience, in an industrial society, will look for moral guidance on industrial matters.

Economic science does not claim to give this, its task being to inform but not to determine the conscience and judgment. But we believe that Christ our Master does give such guidance by His example and teachings, and by the present workings of His Spirit; and therefore under Him Christian authority must in a measure do the same, the authority, that is, of the whole Christian body, and of an enlightened Christian opinion. This is part of the duty of the Christian Society, as witnessing for Christ and representing Him in this present world, occupied with His work of setting up the Kingdom of God, under and amidst the natural conditions of human life. In this work the clergy, whose special duty it is to ponder the bearings of Christian principles, have their part; but the Christian laity, who deal directly with the social and economic facts, can do even more.

The Committee believe that it would be wholly wrong for Christian authority to attempt to interfere with the legitimate evolution of economic and social thought and life by taking a side corporately in the debates between rival social theories or systems. It will not, (for example), at the present day, attempt to identify Christian duty with the acceptance of systems based respectively on collective or individual ownership of the means of production.

But they submit that Christian social duty will operate in two directions :—

1. The recognition, inculcation, and application of certain Christian principles. They offer the following as examples :—

(*a*) The principle of Brotherhood. This principle of Brotherhood, or Fellowship in Christ, proclaiming, as it does, that men are members one of another, should act in all the relations of life as a constant counterpoise to the instinct of competition.

(*b*) The principle of Labour. That every man is bound to service—the service of God and man. Labour and service are to be here understood in their widest and most inclusive sense; but in some sense they are obligatory on all. The wilfully idle man, and the man who lives only for himself, are out of place in a Christian community. Work, accordingly, is not to be looked upon as an irksome necessity for some, but as the honourable task and privilege of all.

(*c*) The principle of Justice. God is no respecter of persons. Inequalities, indeed, of every kind are inwoven with the whole providential order of human life, and are recognised emphatically in our Lord's words. But the social order cannot ignore the interests of any of its parts, and must, moreover, be tested by the degree in which it secures for each freedom for happy, useful, and untrammelled life, and distributes, as widely and equitably as may be, social advantages and opportunities.

(*d*) The principle of Public Responsibility. A Christian community, as a whole, is morally responsible for the character of its own economic and social order, and for deciding to what extent matters affecting that order are to be left to individual initiative, and to the unregulated play of economic forces. Factory and sanitary legislation, the institution of Government labour departments and the influence of Government, or of public opinion and the press, or of eminent citizens, in helping to avoid or reconcile industrial conflicts, are instances in point.

2. Christian opinion should be awake to repudiate and condemn either open breaches of social justice and duty, or maxims and principles of an un-Christian character. It ought to condemn the belief that economic conditions are to be left to the action of material causes and mechanical laws, uncontrolled by any moral responsibility. It can pronounce certain conditions of labour to be intolerable. It can insist that the employer's personal responsibility, as such, is not lost by his membership in a commercial or industrial Company. It can press upon retail purchasers the obligation to consider not only cheapness of the goods supplied to them, but also the probable conditions of their production. It can speak plainly of evils which attach to the economic system under which we live, such as certain forms of luxurious extravagance, the widespread pursuit of money by financial gambling, the dishonesties of trade into which men are driven by feverish competition, and the violences and reprisals of industrial warfare.

It is plain that in these matters disapproval must take every different shade, from plain condemnation of undoubted wrong to tentative opinions about better and worse. Accordingly any organic action of the Church, or any action of the Church's officers, as such, should be very carefully restricted to cases where the rule of right is practically clear, and much the larger part of the matter should be left to the free and flexible agency of the awakened Christian conscience of the community at large, and of its individual members.

If the Christian conscience be thus awakened and active, it will secure the best administration of particular systems, while they

exist, and the modification or change of them, when this is required by the progress of knowledge, thought, and life.

It appears to follow from what precedes that the great need of the Church, in this connection, is the growth and extension of a serious, intelligent, and sympathetic opinion on these subjects, to which numberless Christians have as yet never thought of applying Christian principles. There has been of late no little improvement in this respect, but much remains to be done, and with this view the Committee desire to make the following definite recommendation.

They suggest that, wherever possible, there should be formed, as a part of local Church organisation, Committees consisting chiefly of laymen, whose work should be to study social and industrial problems from the Christian point of view, and to assist in creating and strengthening an enlightened public opinion in regard to such problems, and promoting a more active spirit of social service, as a part of Christian duty.

Such Committees, or bodies of Church workers in the way of social service, while representing no one class of society, and abstaining from taking sides in any disputes between classes, should fearlessly draw attention to the various causes in our economic, industrial, and social system, which call for remedial measures on Christian principles.

Abundant illustration of the kind of matters with which such Committees might deal will be found in the following sections of the report:—

II.

The problem of the Unemployed brings us face to face with these two questions:—

(I.) How best to help those who are unemployed, and in need, at any particular moment.

(II.) How to counteract the causes in the society of our time which tend to drive people into this necessitous class, and make it so numerous.

(I.) The unemployed are of different types and require different modes of treatment.

(*a*) The *unwilling*, such as the lazy, and the vagrant.

These specially need authoritative discipline and corrective management. The existence of such an idle and necessitous class being a danger to society, the State should undertake the duty of dealing with them, both by means of disciplinary authority, and by an enlightened administration of Poor Laws, making labour a condition of relief, and using

all possible means, by training and otherwise, to turn them into good citizens.

(*b*) The *unfit*, viz.: (1) The aged poor, for whom Christian society is bound to provide by pension or otherwise some form of decent support; (2) the sick, who must be nursed and tended while ill, and should be assisted in making a fresh start when they recover; (3) destitute children, who should be maintained and educated, so that they may have a chance of growing up to be honest and useful members of society.

(*c*) The *unfortunate*, the wreckage of our industrial and social system. Many of these are wrecked, not by any fault of their own, but, through dislocations of trade, changes of fashion, mechanical inventions, the lack of technical training, and other causes, and they have a strong claim on Christian society to assist them by some form of organisation ready for the purpose.

(*d*) The *morally weak* who are wrecked through lack of character, being rendered useless by drunkenness and other forms of vice; and they offer a large field for the healing and reforming influences of Christian charity, such as homes and reformatories.

II. The causes which tend to swell the number of the unemployed and suffering poor present even greater difficulties. The Church will best contribute to their solution by patient consideration of such matters as the following:—

(1) Forms of trade or industry, or any usages, which lead to the "sweating" and degradation of the labouring class, and possible methods of reform.

(2) Methods of moralising industrial and commercial relationships.

(3) Stronger control by public opinion and authority over the housing of the poor, both in town and country, and methods by which the existing laws may be more effectually carried out so as to secure the conditions necessary for a decent moral life.

(4) The encouragement of all sound organisations which have for their object the advancement of thrift and temperance, and the assistance of the working man in making provision for sickness and old age.

(5) Possibilities of minimising fluctuations and dislocations of employment, with the sufferings consequent upon them, by means of such agencies as Labour Bureaux, Boards of Conciliation and Arbitration, and some judicious use of public works in times of stress.

(6) Methods of making country life and occupations more

attractive and remunerative, so as to lessen the drift of population into great towns.

(7) The success or failure of the many agencies and schemes, both public and private, which are already in operation for the healing or prevention of these social ills.

III.

In dealing with the subject of Industrial Co-operation, the Committee desire to record their appreciation of the benefits which its originators and supporters have conferred upon the community.

It has helped to spread and strengthen the feeling of mutual membership or brotherhood, and to conciliate the interests of the capitalist, the workman, and the purchaser. It has been equally beneficial in contributing largely to the growth of thrift, independence, a sense of the dignity of labour, and happy family life and contentment, among that portion of the working classes who have taken a share in it. The Committee hope to see it as successfully established on the side of productive industry, as it is in the field of commercial distribution.

At the same time, there would seem to be the need of a note of warning. The very success of the movement is bringing with it an element of danger.

It will be equivalent to the comparative failure of this great movement if it should degenerate into a vast system of joint-stock shopkeeping or industry, conducted on selfish principles, with no dominant moral purpose pervading it, no longer earnestly striving for the amelioration of social and industrial conditions, but aiming chiefly at large dividends.

Such a system is only selfish competition decked out in new garments, and bearing a new name.

The sympathy of the Church with the co-operative movement must depend on the faithful adhesion of those who direct it to its true moral and spiritual purpose.

Such Committees of Social Service as have been recommended above should draw attention to subjects like the following:—

1. The dangers that threaten the co-operative movement through its becoming infected by the spirit of selfish competition, as illustrated by its tendency to give up the principle of profit-sharing on the part of the workers.

2. The elevating influence which the feeling of associated ownership exercises on the character of workmen.

3. The great importance of education.

4. The necessity of confidence in approved leaders, and readiness to entrust responsible authority to capable individuals, and to remunerate them liberally.

5. The vast opportunities for social amelioration which the co-operative system has before it.

The Committee hope that they have shown conclusively how varied and urgent are the questions which demand Christian thought and attention; and that they have sufficiently indicated some of the ways in which it is possible to permeate commercial and industrial life with the regulative and inspiring force of applied Christianity.

They record their conviction that conspicuous, sustained, and widespread effort in this direction, more particularly on the part of Christian laymen, is required at the present time, as one special sign and form of the witness of the Church to the all-sufficiency of her Divine and Incarnate Lord, and to the transforming, enlightening, and quickening power of His Spirit upon human character and life.

J. Hereford,

Chairman.

No. 9.

Report of Committee[1] *appointed to consider and report upon the Book of Common Prayer*—(a) *Additional Services*, (b) *Local Adaptation.*

The Committee have carefully considered the subject referred to them, and feel it to be their duty in this Report to bring before

[1] Names of the Members of the Committee:—

Archbishop of York.
Bishop of Ballarat.
" Bloemfontein.
" Brisbane.
Bishop Coadjutor of Brisbane.
Bishop in Corea.
Bishop of Cork.
" Dallas.
" Derby.
" Dunedin.
Bishop in Eastern Equatorial Africa.
Bishop of Edinburgh.
" Ely (*Chairman*).
" Guiana.
" Guildford. (*Secretary*).
Bishop of Iowa.
Bishop in Kiu Shiu.
Bishop of Lincoln.
Bishop Macrorie.
Bishop of Marlborough.
" Nebraska.
Bishop Oluwole (West. Equat. Africa).
Bishop of Rangoon.
Bishop in South Tokyo.
Bishop of Spokane.
" Springfield.
" Tennessee.
" The Platte.
" Thetford.
" Vermont.
" Wakefield.

the Conference the principles which they think should be observed in providing services other than those in the Book of Common Prayer, and also in adapting to local circumstances those already contained therein.

The several Churches of the Anglican Communion differ materially in their legal position with reference to the Book of Common Prayer. The Church in England is more or less limited in its action by the terms of the Act of Uniformity. The Amendment Act of 1872 provides as follows (35 and 36 Vict., c. 35, sections 3 and 4):—

3. "Upon any special occasion approved by the Ordinary, there may be used in any Cathedral or Church a special form of service approved by the Ordinary, so that there be not introduced into such service anything, except anthems or hymns, which does not form part of the Holy Scriptures or Book of Common prayer.
4. "An additional form of service varying from any form prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer may be used at any hour on any Sunday or Holy-day in any Cathedral or Church in which there are duly read, said, or sung, as required by law on such Sunday or Holy-day at some other hour or hours the order for Morning Prayer, the litany, such part of the order for the administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion as is required to be read on Sundays or Holy-days if there be no Communion, and the order for Evening Prayer, so that there be not introduced into such additional service any portion of the order for the administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion, or anything except anthems or hymns, which does not form part of the Holy Scriptures or Book of Common Prayer, and so that such form of service and the mode in which it is used is for the time being approved by the Ordinary. . . ."

Under the provisions of this clause many services, some for occasional use, others for use daily or weekly, have been introduced and found of considerable value. But the preparation of such services has been much hindered by the limitation the Act appears to impose as regards the choice of materials.

It is not, however, at all clear that the Acts of Uniformity deprived Bishops of the "*jus liturgicum*," including the right to set forth for use in their Dioceses forms of prayer other than such as are prescribed in those Acts. There are several instances of such services or forms of prayer set forth by Bishops for use in their own Dioceses.[1] This was done at the time when earlier Acts of Uniformity, as stringent as that of 1662, were in force, and seems to prove that such Acts were not intended to hamper the

[1] See Appendix, p. 274.

action of Bishops in this respect. But it is to be regretted that the Act of 1872, which enables the Bishop to authorise services taken from Holy Scripture and the Book of Common Prayer, might appear by implication to limit the power he would otherwise possess of setting forth services composed by himself, or drawn from other sources.

As regards any changes in the Book of Common Prayer itself, whether for local adaptation or for any other purpose, such changes for the Church in England would need confirmation by Parliament.

In other Churches of the Anglican Communion, the state of the case is generally different. The Churches of Scotland, of America, of Ireland, and of Japan, have modified, to a greater or less degree, the services in the Book of Common Prayer, and have in some cases added new services. In some of the Colonies either by an Act of the Legislature or by an act or canon of the Spiritual authority no alteration is allowed, unless it be first made by the Church at home; in others there is no such limitation. But that changes, in some cases, are absolutely needed, is quite clear.

The Committee consider that the only proper course, whether for local adaptation of the Book of Common Prayer, or for the provision of additional services, is for the Bishops to avail themselves of the *jus liturgicum* which, by the Common Law of the Church, belongs to their office. It must necessarily be exercised subject to any restrictions imposed by civil or ecclesiastical authority, and it would also, in the opinion of the Committee, be well if the Lambeth Conference were to advise some limitation in all cases upon the independent action of each Bishop in his Diocese where such limitations are not already in force. These principles of action are embodied in the Resolutions appended to this Report.[1]

In the formation of additional services care should be taken to adhere as closely as possible to liturgical usage; and that the distinctive portions of the more solemn offices should not be used apart from their proper place therein.

The Committee think it well to add in an appendix, by way of illustrating their meaning, some examples of additional services and of adaptations of the Book of Common Prayer to local circumstances, which may be found useful or necessary in various parts of the Anglican Communion. Some of the latter are already in many churches in England actually adopted; though without authority, and many of the former are already in many Dioceses provided, under the limitations of the Act of Uniformity Amendment Act, 1872.

A petition from the General Synod of Australia and Tasmania

[1] See above, p. 207.

with reference to the importance of a revised translation of the *Quicunque Vult* being authorised by the Lambeth Conference, was transmitted by His Grace the President to your Committee for their consideration.

Your Committee are of opinion that it is very desirable that action, in accordance with this petition, as expressed in the third of their Resolutions,[1] should be taken.

Signed on behalf of the Committee,

ALWYNE ELY,

July 19*th*, 1897. *Chairman.*

APPENDIX.

Additional Services.

(*a*) Additional services for Sundays: Holydays: Weekdays: for the Rogation Days: for Harvest Thanksgiving: Services of Intercession for Missions: Services for Children: Form of Admission into the Church of those Baptised otherwise than according to the Service of the Church: A service for Burial of Children: for Burial of Catechumens: A service for the Admission of Readers to their office: and services to be used by Readers.

Adaptations of Book of Common Prayer to Local Circumstances.

(*b*) Shortened Mattins and Evensong: modifications of the various prayers for the sovereign in countries under heathen sovereigns, or under republican government: where there are many communicants and few clergymen some shortening of the form of words used in the distribution of the Holy Sacrament: diminution of number of sponsors required for public baptism: changes in the preface to the Confirmation Service and in the form of the question put to candidates.

Services or Forms of Prayer.

In a volume of Liturgical services, published by the Parker Society in 1847, a list is given of forty-four occasional forms of prayer set forth in the reign of Queen Elizabeth.

Of these, five are stated in their titles to be published or directed to be used by the authority of the Queen: nine "by authority" without specifying of whom: one is only known by a letter in which Parker tells Cecil he has prescribed it for the use of the

[1] See above, p. 208, Resolution 47.

inhabitants of his own Cathedral city in their distress: twenty-four have no title, or none which gives any clue to the authority by which they were published. Of the remaining five, two appear to have been issued by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the other three by Diocesan Bishops on their own authority. Their titles are as follows:—

[II. 1560.] A short form and order to be used in Common Prayer thrice a week for seasonable weather and good success of the Common Affairs of the Realm: meet to be used at this present, and also hereafter when like occasion shall arise, by the discretion of the Ordinaries within the province of Canterbury.

[VII. 1564.] A short form of thanksgiving to God for ceasing the contagious sickness of the plague, to be used in Common Prayer on Sundays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, instead of the Common Prayers used in the time of mortality, set forth by the Bishop of London, to be used in the City of London and the rest of his Diocese, and in other places also at the discretion of the ordinary Ministers of the Churches.

[VIII. 1565.] A form to be used in Common Prayer every Wednesday and Friday within the City and Diocese of Sarum: to excite all godly people to pray unto God for the delivery of those Christians that are now invaded by the Turk.

[IX. 1565.] A short form of thanksgiving to God for the delivery of the Isle of Malta from the invasion and long siege thereof by the great army of the Turks both by sea and land, and for sundry other victories lately obtained by the Christians against the said Turks, to be used in the Common Prayer within the province of Canterbury on Sundays, Wednesdays and Fridays, for the space of six weeks next ensuing the receipt hereof.

Set forth by the Most Reverend Father in God, Matthew, by God's providence, Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England and Metropolitan.

[XVIII. 1585.] An order of prayer and thanksgiving for the preservation of the Queenes Majesties life and salftie to be used of the preachers and Ministers of the Diocese of Winchester.

No. 10.

Report of the Committee[1] *appointed to consider and report upon the Duties of the Church to the Colonies.*

"Our Colonial Empire . . . has some of the fundamental conditions of stability. There are in general three ties by which States are held together: community of race, community of religion, community of interest. By the first two our colonies are evidently bound to us, and this fact by itself makes the connection strong."

These remarkable words of the late Sir John Seeley suggest a religious connection between England and the colonies, which the Church of England is bound to cherish and sustain. In an ideal national Church the interests of every portion would be known to those at the centre of affairs, who would direct their efforts towards the efficient working of the system. The first duty of the Church to the colonies would in the view of your Committee be to acquire accurate and full information regarding the condition of affairs, the second to strengthen its weak points by generous and timely help.

But these duties have not been adequately recognised as resting upon the Church as a whole, and therefore voluntary effort on the part of associated individuals has been relied upon. Your Committee gratefully acknowledge that supplies of men and money have been furnished by the Society for Promoting Christian

[1] Names of the Members of the Committee :—

Bishop of Auckland.
" Ballarat.
" Barbados.
" Bath and Wells.
" Brisbane.
Bishop Coadjutor of Brisbane.
Bishop of California.
" Capetown.
" Colorado.
" Derby.
" Goulburn.
" Guiana.
" Honolulu.
Assistant Bishop of Jamaica.
Bishop of Killaloe.
" Leicester.
" Los Angeles.
" Manchester.
Bishop Marsden.
Bishop of Mauritius.
" Missouri.
" Newcastle.
" Newcastle, N.S.W.
" Newfoundland.
" Niagara.
" Norwich (*Chairman*).
" Nova Scotia.
" Perth.
" Pretoria.
" Qu'Appelle.
" Rockhampton.
Archbishop of Rupertsland.
Bishop of St. Albans.
" Saskatchewan.
" Sydney.
" Toronto.
" Tuam.
" Wellington.

Knowledge, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, the Church Missionary, Colonial and Continental Church and other Societies, supplemented by contributions elicited by Bishops and Clergy who have appealed personally to Church people in England. Some of these societies, and notably also the Council of the Colonial Bishoprics' Fund, have given further and most munificent help in the endowment of Colonial Sees. It is to be hoped, however, that as the State has come to regard the colonies as very much more important than they were deemed in days gone by, so the Church in its corporate capacity may look upon the work that is being done in these outposts and at the front as one that demands far more concentrated attention and wisely considered plans for its successful accomplishment.

Turning now to matters suggested by the actual condition of affairs, your Committee are face to face with the fact that (as they learn from many quarters of the colonial field) large numbers of people who themselves, or whose parents, claim membership in the English Church are destitute of their Church's ministrations, while others through lack of Clergy support the ministrations of other bodies. The duty of providing for their own spiritual needs rests on these settlers as soon as they are in a position so to do, though here an initial difficulty presents itself in consequence of Church people having been accustomed to the assistance of endowments at home, and being slow to recognise the combined privilege and duty of self-support. But as they are the children of the Church of England it becomes her duty to care for them until they have been aroused to a sense of their responsibility and are able to provide for themselves. This care would naturally take the form of a supply of men and means commensurate with the needs of the various colonies. In former days this was attempted by the selection and sending out of Clergy and school-teachers, and since 1787 by the erection of Sees, and by the founding of Church schools and colleges. In more recent years, your Committee think that there has been a disposition so to regard the claims of the heathen world as to lose sight of the fact that those of Church people in the colonies upon the sympathy and help of the Church at home come first in order. To emphasise this priority and to endeavour to meet the very pressing needs of the Church in the Colonies, your Committee offer the following suggestions, under the four heads of Living Agents, Financial Support, the Increase and Support of the Episcopate, and the Care of Emigrants.

I.—*Living Agents.*

Your Committee think it necessary to differentiate between the colonies, for while some are able to supply and train their own

Clergy, and prefer this course to obtaining men from England, there are others which must, at least for a time, depend upon the mother country. Your Committee are of opinion that valuable help may be rendered by a proposed scheme,[1] which they heartily welcome, for service abroad, whereby young Clergy, with the approval of their Diocesans at home, are to be encouraged to take service abroad for a longer or shorter term of years, such service counting as if rendered in England, and their names being retained in the home diocesan calendars. Your Committee understand that the Boards of Missions of the Provinces of Canterbury and York have been asked by the English Episcopate to take steps for giving effect to this scheme, which represents, they are informed, the strong desire of some of the more active and earnest of the younger Clergy, and gives promise of most useful results. Your Committee, however, would add a word of caution, that zeal and a spirit of enterprise are not sufficient qualifications for colonial work; the fact being that in many matters a higher standard of general capability is required for work abroad than at home.

In the training of Clergy, whether in England for the colonies, or in the colonies for themselves, your Committee believe that the Church at home may give great assistance.

St. Augustine's College, Canterbury, and other missionary colleges, have rendered signal service, and it would be well if studentships in these colleges or in the universities could be established, tenable only by men sent home from the colonies for training. Such a course would increase the efficiency of the men, and foster mutual sympathy between Church people at home and in the colonies.

But it is not less important to establish or strengthen colonial colleges and schools, whether for the training of Clergy, or for primary or secondary education. The mother country should give of its best to aid such institutions by the provision of a competent educational staff, and it might be well also to increase the number of studentships which may be held by those who are being educated for the Ministry in and for the colonies themselves.

II.—*Financial Support.*

To do anything which might diminish the wholesome self-reliance which every colony should learn and practise is the last thing which your Committee would propose: but they doubt if the Church at home adequately realises the paramount importance of strengthening the Church in the colonies in its early stages, or in special stages of development. To take illustrations—the rush of Englishmen to the new goldfields of Western Australia, to

[1] See Note A, p. 281.

Queensland and to Mashonaland, and the gradual filling up of that great north-western part of North America which formerly belonged to the Hudson's Bay Company, constitute claims which can only be neglected at the risk of the Church being outstripped by other religious bodies in the care of the great communities which are now in their birth-throes. Your Committee have heard with alarm and apprehension of proposals even to withdraw generous help previously afforded, on the ground that it has been long given, and without any adequate appreciation of the true position of affairs. A comparison of the progress of the various religious bodies in the Dominion of Canada according to the census returns of 1881 and 1891 would suggest lessons as to the serious danger of any premature withdrawal of financial support. The principle of gradual withdrawal according to the growth of the colony is undoubtedly sound, but special circumstances require special treatment, and liberal aid in the early stages of a rising community, in any special time of distress, and at epochs (such as the present in North-West America) on which the issues of the whole future largely depend, is from every point of view wise and true policy.

While the duty of the whole Church in assisting the colonies financially is thus plain, your Committee think there is one point on which clear and decided teaching should be constantly given at home, viz.: the manifest duty of those who derive income from colonial property or securities to contribute to the support and furtherance of the Church's cause in the colony where such property is situate. There are colonies where the Church is struggling with difficulties, and yet from which large revenues are drawn by men and women who live in England, and who give their money, if and when they give it, rather to the place where they live than to the supply of spiritual privileges to the toilers who contribute to their fortunes.

Your Committee have already referred to the necessity of aiding the primary and secondary educational work of the colonies in respect of educational staff. They would add that where Church day and boarding schools have yet to be provided or have inadequate endowment, or are not self-supporting, immediate and generous aid should be given, for the future of the Church is largely dependent upon the rising generation being thoroughly and soundly educated on a religious basis.

III.—*The Episcopate.*

Your Committee moreover feel bound to call attention, first, to the need of a further extension of the Episcopate in the colonies, and, secondly, to the great difficulty caused by the inadequate

endowment of bishoprics, owing in not a few cases to the depreciation in the value of property. Financial support cannot be better given than in this direction, for it has been proved by ample experience that every new See, adequately supported, leads to a general quickening of Church life, and so, even financially, to a large increase of revenue for Church purposes.

IV.—*Emigrants.*

Your Committee finally would draw the attention of the Church to the report of the Lambeth Conference in 1888 on the care of emigrants.[1] The links between the home Dioceses and the Dioceses in the United States of America, or in the colonies, in reference to emigrants, are still far too weak. Commendatory letters should in every case be given to those who emigrate, and where possible the authorities of the Diocese abroad should be communicated with. The emigration agents of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge are frequently able to communicate with the authorities abroad if only the parochial clergy will give full written particulars. There is one fact in connection with emigration which should never be forgotten. Emigrants when they land in a new country should have been so clearly taught why they are members of the Church of England as to be in no danger of drifting to other bodies from ignorance, as is often alleged to be the case. The fact suggests that one very necessary duty of the Church at home is so to teach Christianity as the Church has received it, that those who emigrate elsewhere shall retain and practise what they have learnt at home.

Your Committee trust that the Church may evoke from her children at home, on behalf of her Dioceses in the colonies, an enthusiasm as spontaneous and eager as that recently shown, on the sixtieth anniversary of Her Majesty's Accession, for the representatives of the several colonies. The Church at home and the Church in the colonies are essentially one body, and "if one member suffer all the members suffer with it." The prosperity and efficiency of the Church in the distant portions of the Empire cannot but give a reflex blessing to the work at home, and thus the Church is really but adding to its own efficiency by the care with which it watches over and cherishes its Provinces and Dioceses abroad.

JOH: NORVIC:

July 23rd, 1897. *Chairman.*

[1] See above, p. 141.

Note (A).

The outlines of the scheme for service abroad referred to on page 278 (*supra*) are as follows:—

1. An Association may be formed of men who are willing to serve abroad if duly invited to do so, and who have the consent of their Bishops for the purpose.

2. A Council should be formed of capable persons who really know the countries in which work under this scheme is to be done, some of whom should know or have the opportunity of watching the career in England of men who are willing to work under the scheme abroad.

3. The request for men who belong to the Association to work in any Colonial Diocese must come from the Bishop of such Diocese, and be made to the Council, who before inviting any member of the Association to undertake work in the Colonies, must communicate with his Bishop in England.

4. When any man is so selected and appointed to serve abroad, in order that he may be still in touch with the Home Diocese, it is advisable that his name be printed in the calendar of that Diocese as on service abroad.

Note (B).

ACTION OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE APPOINTED BY COMMITTEE NO. X TO CONSIDER THE OPERATION OF THE COLONIAL CLERGY ACT, 1874.

Letter sent to the English Diocesan Bishops.

My Lord Archbishop, or Bishop,

I am desired, as Chairman of the Committee of the Lambeth Conference, appointed to consider "Our Duties to the Colonies," to forward to you the subjoined report of a Sub-Committee on the operation of the Colonial Clergy Act, 1874.

(Signed) Joh: Norvic:

July 26th, 1897.

The Sub-Committee met at Church House, on July 15th, 8.30 p.m.

Present:—The Archbishop of Rupertsland, the Bishops of Auckland, Ballarat, Bath and Wells, Capetown, Goulburn, Guiana, Manchester, Newcastle (*Secretary*), St. Albans, and Sydney (*Chairman*).

The Colonial Clergy Act, 1874, was read and carefully considered, together with the official letter of the Lambeth Conference

(1878), (see above, p. 99), and the letter from the late Archbishop of Canterbury to the Primates and Metropolitans.

The following report was agreed to by the Sub-Committee:—

After careful consideration of the Colonial Clergy Act, 1874, of the difficulties found to arise in carrying out its provisions, and of the extreme difficulty in carrying fresh ecclesiastical legislation through Parliament, the Sub-Committee do not find themselves able to recommend any attempt to procure a repeal or alteration of the Act itself. The Sub-Committee are, however, aware of a certain soreness which has resulted in some quarters from the operation of the Act, of which three illustrations among others may be fitly given.

1. The anomaly—that Clergy who were ordained in England for the colonies by an English Bishop, and therefore have passed the ordinary English examination for Holy Orders, and were in no way pledged by the manner of their education to foreign or missionary work, and afterwards return to England, after approved service, with the sanction of their Bishop, find a difficulty in being licensed in England on the same terms as Clergy who have been ministering in England.

2. The difficulty which colonial Clergy, who have served faithfully, and possibly with distinction, for an adequate number of years (say 15), experience in obtaining licences to serve in England on the same terms as Clergy who have been ordained by Bishops of the English Bench.

3. The difficulty which Clergy, coming from the colonies to England for rest and change, but without any idea of permanent settlement, experience in officiating in England during their leave of absence, as sanctioned by their respective Bishops.

The Sub-Committee desire to express their confident hope that the Archbishops and Bishops in England will administer the act in a generous and considerate spirit, especially in dealing with the case of colonial Clergy of long experience and proved efficiency.

Signed (on behalf of the Sub-Committee),

W. S. Sydney,

Chairman of Sub-Committee.

No. 11.

Report of the Committee[1] *appointed to consider the subject of Degrees in Divinity.*

Your Committee consider that they will best introduce this subject to the Conference, first, by stating as shortly as possible the conditions of the question in the Colonies and the United States of America; and next by noticing any attempts which have been made to meet existing difficulties; and finally by submitting certain proposals for consideration by the Conference.

I. In many Dioceses of the Anglican Communion, notably in India, South Africa, Australia, Tasmania and New Zealand, the Universities, which should properly be channels of all Degrees, are purely secular Institutions, and therefore, from the nature of the case, unfitted under present conditions to include a Faculty of Divinity. This being so, it is felt, in some of the countries so situated, that a disability is imposed alike on candidates for Holy Orders, and on those already ordained. Young men preparing for the Sacred Ministry are unable to avail themselves of any course in Theology forming part of the system of a University, while those already ordained are deprived of the healthy stimulus to and guidance in further study, which a system of University Examinations and Certificates would afford.

In Canada the need does not arise, inasmuch as there are already Universities in connection with the Church with power by Charter to confer Degrees in Divinity. The Provincial Synod of Canada, in particular, has established by Canon a Board of Examiners for Degrees in Divinity, consisting of a representative from each of the three Church Universities and the three Theological Colleges within the Ecclesiastical Province, under the Chairmanship of a Bishop, thus providing a uniform standard of examination for B.D. and D.D., as well as a Voluntary Preliminary Examination, for ten Dioceses.

In the United States of America, while some of the institutions empowered to confer degrees are very careful in the exercise of the

[1] Names of the Members of the Committee:—

Bishop of Adelaide.
" Ballarat.
" Bloemfontein.
" Dover (*Secretary*).
" Goulburn (*Chairman*).
Bishop of Honduras.
" Springfield.
" Stepney.
" Tennessee.
" Toronto.

powers entrusted to them, it is generally allowed that, in the case of others, Degrees in Divinity are too plentifully conferred and too easily obtained, and it is also with equal unanimity conceded that some restraints are needed to check their unwise bestowal, and some safeguards to protect their character.

Under these circumstances the question has seriously arisen, and especially in the General Synod of Australia and Tasmania, how to provide some trustworthy and creditable system of Examinations and Certificates in Theology, by means of which Candidates for Ordination and those already ordained may be encouraged to raise the standard of their Theological knowledge. The important bearing of such a provision on the future supply of duly qualified clergy is obvious. It also might serve as an important link between the Church in England and that in the Colonies and elsewhere, by furnishing a common standard of Theological attainment recognised by the Church both at home and abroad.

II. In South Africa the subject has been brought before the Bishops of the Province by the Diocese of Bloemfontein, and is about to come under their consideration.

In New Zealand a Board of Theological Studies has been established, by which examinations in four grades are held annually. To these examinations laymen also are admitted. Certificates of having passed these grades are issued, specifying in which of three classes at the particular examination the recipient has been placed.

In Australia and Tasmania a very important movement has been begun. A Committee of the General Synod entered into communication with several Universities in England and elsewhere. But the result has been disappointing. The difficulties in the case of Oxford and Cambridge seemed for the present to be insuperable, owing to residence being required. The Durham special degree of B.D., though open to Candidates without residence, can only be obtained by those who have been fifteen years in Holy Orders, and is therefore useless as a stimulus to reading in the earlier years of ministerial life. Trinity University, Toronto, though favourable at first to a scheme for Local Examinations in Australia with Degrees in Divinity, found itself unable to continue the facilities which it had at one time granted, and which would have to some extent supplied the need there felt for some recognised Certificate in Theology. Lambeth Degrees in Divinity are at present granted, at the Archbishop of Canterbury's discretion, only to persons already eminent in the Faculty of Theology, and considerable difficulties have been felt in opening these Degrees (or, at least, both that of Bachelor and Doctor) to Examination. The late Archbishop, however, favourably entertained a suggestion that Clergy who had taken a Degree in Arts in any British University (which would include Universities in the

Colonies) might be admitted to Examination, after a due lapse of time, for the Degree of Bachelor in Divinity.

In view of the result of these prolonged negotiations, the General Synod of Australia and Tasmania have recently founded an "Australian College of Theology," under the direction of the Bishops, with power to award Certificates in Theology after Examination. Four Diplomas or Certificates are contemplated, the lowest—that of "Associate in Theology"—being open to all Communicant members of the Church in the Dioceses concerned, and the other three, viz., "Licentiate in Theology," "Scholar in Theology," and "Fellow of the Australian College of Theology," being open to clergymen holding licences in those Dioceses, the two higher grades involving the holding of the next lower grade for a period of years, and the last, that of "Fellow," being also conferable without examination on distinguished divines *honoris causa*.

III. Your Committee feel that the granting of such Certificates should not be left entirely to the initiative and direction of particular Churches, and that their value would be greatly enhanced if they formed part of some general scheme recognised by the Anglican Communion throughout the world. The Lambeth Conference appears to be the only body able to formulate such a scheme, which, among other advantages, would create a bond of union between distant provinces; would tend in many places to raise the qualifications of candidates for Holy Orders, and the Theological attainments of the Clergy; and might ultimately lead to a great Central Examining University for promoting the study of Theology under the direction of the Church, whose Certificates or Degrees would command universal respect.

But, short of this, your Committee would respectfully urge upon the Conference the desirability of approaching, in the name of the whole Conference, some of the recognised Universities which have shown themselves favourable to local examinations, or their Boards of Divinity, with the view of obtaining from them some modification or extension of their rules, so as to place within the reach of colonists and others the advantage of an examination in Theology, with a Degree or Certificate.

They also venture humbly to suggest that a Lambeth Degree of B.A. might be utilised, under well-considered regulations, as one which might be taken after a Final Examination in Theology, just as it is now possible to take a B.A. Degree at Oxford and Cambridge in a final Theological School, after previous examination in general subjects. This might be followed, after an interval of years, and further examination, by the B.D. Degree.

Your Committee respectfully ask for the careful consideration of this Report, believing that though the subject may at first

appear, in comparison with others, of small immediate moment, it is yet of grave importance to the future study of Theology in various Provinces of the Church, and bears very directly upon the maintenance among the Clergy in such provinces of a high standard of Theological knowledge.

W. GOULBURN,

Chairman.

XV.

1908.

LIST OF BISHOPS ATTENDING THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE OF 1908, ARRANGED ACCORDING TO PROVINCES. (See p. 45.)

Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Rev. R. T. Davidson, D.D.).
Bishop of Dover (Rt. Rev. W. Walsh, D.D.).
Bishop of Croydon (Rt. Rev H. H. Pereira, D.D.).
Bishop of London (Rt. Rev. A. F. Winnington-Ingram, D.D.).
Bishop of Stepney (Rt. Rev. C. G. Lang, D.D.).
Bishop of Islington (Rt. Rev. C. H. Turner, D.D.).
Bishop of Kensington (Rt. Rev. F. E. Ridgeway, D.D.).
Bishop Barry (Rt. Rev. A. Barry, D.D.).
Bishop Wilkinson (Rt. Rev. T. E. Wilkinson, D.D.).
Bishop of Winchester (Rt. Rev. H. E. Ryle, D.D.).
Bishop of Southampton (Rt. Rev. J. Macarthur, D.D.).
Bishop of Dorking (Rt. Rev. C. H. Boutflower, D.D.).
Bishop of Bangor (Rt. Rev. W. H. Williams, D.D.).
Bishop of Bath and Wells (Rt. Rev. G. W. Kennion, D.D.).
Bishop Stirling (Rt. Rev. W. H. Stirling, D.D.).
Bishop of Birmingham (Rt. Rev. C. Gore, D.D.).
Bishop of Bristol (Rt. Rev. G. F. Browne, D.D.).
Bishop Marsden (Rt. Rev. S. E. Marsden, D.D.).
Bishop of Chichester (Rt. Rev. C. J. Ridgeway, D.D.).
Bishop of Ely (Rt. Rev. F. H. Chase, D.D.).
Bishop Harrison (Rt. Rev. W. T. Harrison, D.D.).
Bishop Hodges (Rt. Rev. E. N. Hodges, D.D.).
Bishop of Exeter (Rt. Rev. A. Robertson, D.D.).
Bishop of Crediton (Rt. Rev. R. E. Trefusis, D.D.).
Bishop of Gloucester (Rt. Rev. E. C. S. Gibson, D.D.).
Bishop of Hereford (Rt. Rev. J. Percival, D.D.).
Bishop Mather (Rt. Rev. H. Mather, D.D.).
Bishop of Lichfield (Rt. Rev. A. Legge, D.D.).
Bishop Anson (Rt. Rev. A. J. R. Anson, D.D.).

Bishop of Lincoln (Rt. Rev. E. King, D.D.).
Bishop of Grantham (Rt. Rev. W. Maccarthy, D.D.).
Bishop of Llandaff (Rt. Rev. J. P. Hughes, D.D.).
Bishop of Norwich (Rt. Rev. J. Sheepshanks, D.D.).
Bishop of Thetford (Rt. Rev. J. P. A. Bowers, D.D.).
Bishop of Ipswich (Rt. Rev. H. L. Paget, D.D.).
Bishop of Oxford (Rt. Rev. F. Paget, D.D.).
Bishop of Reading (Rt. Rev. J. L. Randall, D.D.).
Bishop of Peterborough (Rt. Rev. E. Carr Glyn, D.D.).
Bishop of Leicester (Rt. Rev. L. Clayton, D.D.).
Bishop Mitchinson (Rt. Rev. J. Mitchinson, D.D.).
Bishop of Rochester (Rt. Rev. J. R. Harmer, D.D.).
Bishop of St. Albans (Rt. Rev. E. Jacob, D.D.).
Bishop of Colchester (Rt. Rev. H. F. Johnson, D.D.).
Bishop of Barking (Rt. Rev. T. Stevens, D.D.).
Bishop of St. Asaph (Rt. Rev. A. G. Edwards, D.D.).
Bishop of St. David's (Rt. Rev. J. Owen, D.D.).
Bishop of Swansea (Rt. Rev. J. Lloyd, D.D.).
Bishop of Salisbury (Rt. Rev. J. Wordsworth, D.D.).
Bishop of Southwark (Rt. Rev. E. S. Talbot, D.D.).
Bishop of Kingston-upon-Thames (Rt. Rev. Cecil Hook, D.D.).
Bishop of Woolwich (Rt. Rev. J. C. Leeke, D.D.).
Bishop of Southwell (Rt. Rev. E. Hoskyns, D.D.).
Bishop of Derby (Rt. Rev. E. A. Were, D.D.).
Bishop Baynes (Rt. Rev. A. H. Baynes, D.D.).
Bishop of Truro (Rt. Rev. C. W. Stubbs, D.D.).
Bishop of St. German's (Rt. Rev. J. R. Cornish, D.D.).
Bishop of Worcester (Rt. Rev. H. W. Yeatman-Biggs, D.D.).
Bishop Ingham (Rt. Rev. E. G. Ingham, D.D.).
Bishop Montgomery (Rt. Rev. H. H. Montgomery, D.D.).
Bishop Taylor Smith (Rt. Rev. J. Taylor Smith, D.D.).

Archbishop of York (Most Rev. W. D. Maclagan, D.D.).
Bishop of Beverley (Rt. Rev. R. J. Crosthwaite, D.D.).
Bishop of Hull (Rt. Rev. R. F. L. Blunt, D.D.).
Bishop of Sheffield (Rt. Rev. J. N. Quirk, D.D.).
Bishop of Durham (Rt. Rev. H. C. G. Moule, D.D.).
Bishop of Jarrow (Rt. Rev. G. Nickson, D.D.).
Bishop of Carlisle (Rt. Rev. J. W. Diggle, D.D.).
Bishop of Barrow-in-Furness (Rt. Rev. H. Ware, D.D.).
Bishop of Chester (Rt. Rev. F. J. Jayne, D.D.).
Bishop of Liverpool (Rt. Rev. F. J. Chavasse, D.D.).
Bishop of Manchester (Rt. Rev. E. A. Knox, D.D.).
Bishop of Burnley (Rt. Rev. A. Pearson, D.D.).
Bishop Thornton (Rt. Rev. S. Thornton, D.D.).
Bishop of Newcastle (Rt. Rev. N. D. J. Straton, D.D.).

Bishop of Ripon (Rt. Rev. W. Boyd Carpenter, D.D.).
Bishop of Richmond (Rt. Rev. J. J. Pulleine, D.D.).
Bishop of Knaresborough (Rt. Rev. L. F. M. B. Smith, D.D.).
Bishop of Wakefield (Rt. Rev. G. R. Eden, D.D.).
Bishop of Sodor and Man (Rt. Rev. T. W. Drury, D.D.).

Archbishop of Armagh (Most Rev. W. Alexander, D.D.).
Bishop of Clogher (Rt. Rev. M. Day, D.D.).
Bishop of Derry (Rt. Rev. G. A. Chadwick, D.D.).
Bishop of Down and Connor (Rt. Rev. J. B. Crozier, D.D.).
Bishop of Meath (Most Rev. J. B. Keene, D.D.).
Bishop of Tuam (Rt. Rev. J. O'Sullivan, D.D.).

Archbishop of Dublin (Most Rev. J. F. Peacocke, D.D.).
Bishop of Cashel (Rt. Rev. H. S. O'Hara, D.D.).
Bishop of Cork (Rt. Rev. W. E. Meade, D.D.).
Bishop of Killaloe (Rt. Rev. M. Archdall, D.D.).
Bishop of Limerick (Rt. Rev. R. D'A. Orpen, D.D.).
Bishop of Ossory (Rt. Rev. C. F. D'Arcy, D.D.).

Bishop of Brechin, *Primus* (Most Rev. W. J. F. Robberds, D.D.).
Bishop of Aberdeen (Rt. Rev. R. Ellis, D.D.).
Bishop of Argyll (Rt. Rev. K. Mackenzie, D.D.).
Bishop of Edinburgh (Rt. Rev. J. Dowden, D.D.).
Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway (Rt. Rev. A. E. Campbell, D.D.).
Bishop of Moray, Ross, and Caithness (Rt. Rev. A. J. Maclean, D.D.).
Bishop of St. Andrews, Dunkeld, and Dunblane (Rt. Rev. C. E. Plumb, D.D.).

Bishop of Calcutta, *Metropolitan* (Most Rev. R. S. Copleston, D.D.).
Bishop of Bombay (Rt. Rev. E. J. Palmer, D.D.).
Bishop of Chota Nagpur (Rt. Rev. F. Westcott, D.D.).
Bishop of Colombo (Rt. Rev. E. A. Copleston, D.D.).
Bishop of Lahore (Rt. Rev. G. A. Lefroy, D.D.).
Bishop of Madras (Rt. Rev. H. Whitehead, D.D.).
Bishop of Nagpur (Rt. Rev. E. Chatterton, D.D.).
Bishop of Rangoon (Rt. Rev. A. M. Knight, D.D.).
Bishop of Tinnevelly and Madura (Rt. Rev. A. A. Williams, D.D.).
Bishop of Travancore and Cochin (Rt. Rev. C. H. Gill, D.D.).

Bishop of Bloemfontein (Rt. Rev. A. Chandler, D.D.).

Bishop of Grahamstown (Rt. Rev. C. E. Cornish, D.D.).
Bishop of Lebombo (Rt. Rev. W. E. Smyth, M.B.).
Bishop of Natal (Rt. Rev. F. S. Baines, D.D.).
Bishop of Pretoria (Rt. Rev. W. M. Carter, D.D.).
Bishop of St. Helena (Rt. Rev. W. A. Holbech, D.D.).
Bishop of St. John's, Kaffraria (Rt. Rev. J. W. Williams, D.D.).
Bishop of Zululand (Rt. Rev. W. L. Vyvyan, D.D.).

Archbishop of Toronto, *Primate and Metropolitan* (Most Rev. A. Sweatman, D.D.).
Bishop of Algoma (Rt. Rev. G. Thorneloe, D.D.).
Bishop of Fredericton (Rt. Rev. J. A. Richardson, D.D.).
Bishop of Huron (Rt. Rev. D. Williams, D.D.).
Bishop of Montreal (Rt. Rev. J. Carmichael, D.D.).
Bishop of Nova Scotia (Rt. Rev. C. L. Worrell, D.D.).
Bishop of Niagara (Rt. Rev. J. P. Du Moulin, D.D.).
Bishop of Ontario (Rt. Rev. W. L. Mills, D.D.).
Bishop of Ottawa (Rt. Rev. C. Hamilton, D.D.).
Bishop of Quebec (Rt. Rev. A. H. Dunn, D.D.).

Archbishop of Rupertsland, *Metropolitan* (Most Rev. S. B. Matheson, D.D.).
Bishop of Columbia (Rt. Rev. W. W. Perrin, D.D.).
Bishop of Keewatin (Rt. Rev. J. Lofthouse, D.D.).
Bishop of Moosonee (Rt. Rev. G. Holmes, D.D.).
Bishop of Qu'Appelle (Rt. Rev. J. Grisdale, D.D.).
Bishop of Saskatchewan (Rt. Rev. J. A. Newnham, D.D.).
Bishop of Yukon (Rt. Rev. I. O. Stringer, D.D.).

Bishop of New Westminster (Rt. Rev. J. Dart, D.D.).

Archbishop of West Indies and Bishop of Jamaica, *Metropolitan* (Most Rev. E. Nuttall, D.D.).
Bishop Coadjutor of Jamaica (Rt. Rev. A. E. Joscelyne, D.D.).
Bishop of Antigua (Rt. Rev. W. Farrar, D.D.).
Bishop of Barbados (Rt. Rev. W. P. Swaby, D.D.).
Bishop of Guiana (Rt. Rev. E. A. Parry, D.D.).
Bishop of Nassau (Rt. Rev. W. B. Hornby, D.D.).
Bishop of Trinidad (Rt. Rev. J. F. Welsh, D.D.).

Archbishop of Sydney, *Primate and Metropolitan* (Most Rev. W. S. Smith, D.D.).
Bishop of Goulburn (Rt. Rev. C. G. Barlow, D.D.).

Bishop of Grafton and Armidale (Rt. Rev. H. E. Cooper, D.D.).
Bishop of Newcastle, N.S.W. (Rt. Rev. J. F. Stretch, D.D.).
Bishop of Riverina (Rt. Rev. E. A. Anderson, D.D.).

Archbishop of Melbourne, *Metropolitan* (Most Rev. H. L. Clarke, D.D.).
Bishop of Bendigo (Rt. Rev. J. D. Langley, D.D.).
Bishop of Wangaratta (Rt. Rev. T. H. Armstrong, D.D.).

Archbishop of Brisbane, *Metropolitan* (Most Rev. St. C. G. A. Donaldson, D.D.).
Bishop of Carpentaria (Rt. Rev. G. White, D.D.).
Bishop of New Guinea (Rt. Rev. M. J. Stone-Wigg, D.D.).
Bishop of North Queensland (Rt. Rev. G. H. Frodsham, D.D.).
Bishop of Rockhampton (Rt. Rev. N. Dawes, D.D.).

Bishop of Adelaide (Rt. Rev. A. Nutter Thomas, D.D.).
Bishop of Bunbury (Rt. Rev. F. Goldsmith, D.D.).
Bishop of Perth (Rt. Rev. C. O. L. Riley, D.D.).

Bishop of Auckland (Rt. Rev. M. R. Neligan, D.D.).
Bishop of Melanesia (Rt. Rev. C. Wilson, M.A.).
Bishop of Nelson (Rt. Rev. C. O. Mules, D.D.).
Bishop of Waiapu (Rt. Rev. W. L. Williams, D.D.).
Bishop of Wellington (Rt. Rev. F. Wallis, D.D.).

Bishop in Fuh-kien (Rt. Rev. H. MacC. E. Price, M.A.).
Bishop in Hokkaido (Rt. Rev. P. K. Fyson, D.D.).
Bishop in Korea (Rt. Rev. A. B. Turner, D.D.).
Bishop in Mid China (Rt. Rev. H. J. Molony, D.D.).
Bishop in North China (Rt. Rev. C. P. Scott, D.D.).
Bishop in Western China (Rt. Rev. W. W. Cassels, B.A.).
Bishop of Osaka (Rt. Rev. H. J. Foss, D.D.).
Bishop in South Japan (Rt. Rev. H. Evington, D.D.).
Bishop in South Tokyo (Rt. Rev. W. Awdry, D.D.).
Bishop in Victoria, Hong Kong (Rt. Rev. G. H. Lander, D.D.).

Bishop of Likoma (Rt. Rev. G. Trower, D.D.).
Bishop in Madagascar (Rt. Rev. G. L. King, D.D.).
Bishop of Mauritius (Rt. Rev. F. A. Gregory, D.D.).
Bishop of Sierra Leone (Rt. Rev. E. H. Elwin, D.D.).
Bishop of Singapore (Rt. Rev. G. F. Hose, D.D.).
Bishop of Uganda (Rt. Rev. A. R. Tucker, D.D.).

Bishop of Western Equatorial Africa (Rt. Rev. H. Tugwell, D.D.).
Assistant Bishop of Western Equatorial Africa (Rt. Rev. I. Oluwole, D.D.).
Assistant Bishop of Western Equatorial Africa (Rt. Rev. J. Johnson, D.D.).
Assistant Bishop of Western Equatorial Africa (Rt. Rev. N. T. Hamlyn, D.D.).
Bishop of Zanzibar (Rt. Rev. J. E. Hine, D.D.).

Bishop of the Falkland Islands (Rt. Rev. E. F. Every, D.D.).
Bishop of Gibraltar (Rt. Rev. W. E. Collins, D.D.).
Bishop in Jerusalem and the East (Rt. Rev. G. F. P. Blyth, D.D.).
Bishop of Newfoundland (Rt. Rev. L. Jones, D.D.).

Bishop of Missouri, *Presiding Bishop* (Most Rev. D. S. Tuttle, D.D.).
Bishop of Albany (Rt. Rev. W. C. Doane, D.D.).
Bishop of Central Pennsylvania (Rt. Rev. Ethelbert Talbot, D.D.).
Bishop of Chicago (Rt. Rev. C. P. Anderson, D.D.).
Bishop of Colorado (Rt. Rev. C. S. Olmsted, D.D.).
Bishop of Connecticut (Rt. Rev. C. B. Brewster, D.D.).
Bishop of Duluth (Rt. Rev. J. D. Morrison, D.D.).
Bishop of Harrisburg (Rt. Rev. J. H. Darlington, D.D.).
Bishop of Indianapolis (Rt. Rev. J. M. Francis, D.D.).
Bishop of Kansas (Rt. Rev. F. R. Millspaugh, D.D.).
Bishop of Lexington (Rt. Rev. L. W. Burton, D.D.).
Bishop of Los Angeles (Rt. Rev. J. H. Johnson, D.D.).
Bishop of Maine (Rt. Rev. R. Codman, D.D.).
Bishop of Marquette (Rt. Rev. G. M. Williams, D.D.).
Bishop of Massachusetts (Rt. Rev. W. Lawrence, D.D.).
Bishop of Michigan (Rt. Rev. C. D. Williams, D.D.).
Bishop of Michigan City (Rt. Rev. J. H. White, D.D.).
Bishop of Milwaukee (Rt. Rev. W. W. Webb, D.D.).
Bishop of Minnesota (Rt. Rev. S. C. Edsall, D.D.).
Bishop of Newark (Rt. Rev. E. S. Lines, D.D.).
Bishop Coadjutor of New Hampshire (Rt. Rev. E. M. Parker, D.D.).
Bishop of New York (Rt. Rev. D. H. Greer, D.D.).
Bishop of North Carolina (Rt. Rev. J. B. Cheshire, D.D.).
Bishop of Ohio (Rt. Rev. W. A. Leonard, D.D.).
Bishop of Oregon (Rt. Rev. C. Scadding, D.D.).
Bishop Coadjutor of Pennsylvania (Rt. Rev. A. Mackay-Smith, D.D.).

Bishop of Pittsburgh (Rt. Rev. C. Whitehead, D.D.).
Bishop of Rhode Island (Rt. Rev. W. N. McVickar, D.D.).
Bishop of Southern Ohio (Rt. Rev. B. Vincent, D.D.).
Bishop of Southern Virginia (Rt. Rev. A. M. Randolph, D.D.).
Bishop Coadjutor of Southern Virginia (Rt. Rev. B. D. Tucker, D.D.).
Bishop of Springfield (Rt. Rev. E. W. Osborne, D.D.).
Bishop of Tennessee (Rt. Rev. T. F. Gailor, D.D.).
Bishop of Texas (Rt. Rev. G. H. Kinsolving, D.D.).
Bishop of Vermont (Rt. Rev. A. C. A. Hall, D.D.).
Bishop of Virginia (Rt. Rev. R. A. Gibson, D.D.).
Bishop Coadjutor of West Virginia (Rt. Rev. W. L. Gravatt, D.D.).
Bishop Coadjutor of Western Michigan (Rt. Rev. J. N. McCormick, D.D.).
Bishop of Western New York (Rt. Rev. W. D. Walker, D.D.).

Missionary Bishop of Alaska (Rt. Rev. P. T. Rowe, D.D.).
Missionary Bishop of Hankow (Rt. Rev. L. H. Roots, D.D.).
Missionary Bishop of Kearney (Rt. Rev. A. R. Graves, D.D.).
Missionary Bishop of North Dakota (Rt. Rev. C. Mann, D.D.).
Missionary Bishop of Olympia (Rt. Rev. F. W. Keator, D.D.).
Missionary Bishop of Sacramento (Rt. Rev. W. H. Moreland, D.D.).
Missionary Bishop of Salina (Rt. Rev. S. M. Griswold, D.D.).
Missionary Bishop of Shanghai (Rt. Rev. F. R. Graves, D.D.).
Assistant Missionary Bishop of South Dakota (Rt. Rev. F. F. Johnson, D.D.).
Missionary Bishop of Southern Brazil (Rt. Rev. L. L. Kinsolving, D.D.).
Missionary Bishop of Southern Florida (Rt. Rev. W. C. Gray, D.D.).
Missionary Bishop of Spokane (Rt. Rev. L. H. Wells, D.D.).
Missionary Bishop of Tokyo (Rt. Rev. J. McKim, D.D.).
Missionary Bishop of Utah (Rt. Rev. F. S. Spalding, D.D.).
Bishop Courtney (Rt. Rev. F. Courtney, D.D.).
Bishop Jaggar (Rt. Rev. T. A. Jaggar, D.D.).

XVI.

Encyclical Letter issued by the Bishops attending the fifth Lambeth Conference, 1908. (See p. 44).

To the Faithful in Christ Jesus, Greeting—

We, Archbishops, Bishops Metropolitan, and other Bishops of the Holy Catholic Church in full communion with the Church of England, two hundred and forty-two in number, all having superintendence over Dioceses or lawfully commissioned to exercise Episcopal functions therein, assembled from divers parts of the earth at Lambeth Palace, in the year of our Lord 1908, under the presidency of the Most Reverend Randall Thomas, by Divine Providence Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of All England and Metropolitan, after offering prayer and praise in the Cathedral Church of Canterbury and receiving in Westminster Abbey the Blessed Sacrament of the Lord's Body and Blood, and invoking the help and guidance of the Holy Spirit, have taken into consideration various questions affecting the welfare of God's people and the work of the Church of Christ in divers parts of the world.

We who speak are bearers of the sacred commission of the ministry given by our Lord through His Apostles to the Church. And the Church in which by the Providence of God we bear this office carries responsibilities which are peculiarly its own. These arise of necessity from its past history and its present position. They are patent to the world, and we need not set them forth afresh. In the development of human history they have been laid upon us by the good hand of our God. We receive them with humility and hope: with humility, and with penitence for

our own failures and shortcomings, as we recall the great traditions of the past, the grave and careful learning, the courageous and patient reverence for truth, and the fervent devotion of those who were our fathers in the Faith; with hope, for we realise that the links which bind us to that historic past are not fetters upon the free and enterprising spirit which is essential to progress. We belong to a Church which, in the words of one of our number who has entered into rest, is the "Church of free men, educating them into a knowledge of the liberty wherewith Christ hath made them free."

The subjects proposed for consideration were first brought before us in Sessions of the whole Conference, lasting for six full days, from July 6th to July 11th. Having been there set forth in outline, they were then referred to large and carefully chosen Committees; and the Reports of these Committees, with the Resolutions which they had prepared, were subsequently laid before the Conference, meeting again to consider them in full Session from July 27th to August 5th. We trust that by this procedure a right use has been made of the opportunity of the past month, and that the outcome of our work, now proffered to Christ's people, represents at once that detailed study which is the especial task of a committee, and that weight of judgment which belongs to the decisions of an assembly gathered from all parts of the world and bringing to the process of deliberation the manifold experience and knowledge acquired under widely different conditions in widely sundered fields of labour.

The judgment of the Conference is expressed in the Resolutions, seventy-eight in number, appended to this Letter.[1] These, and these alone, are affirmed by the Conference. The Reports, which are also printed herewith,[2] have been received by the Conference; and the Conference has directed that they should be published; but the responsibility for the statements and opinions which they contain

[1] See p. 318. [2] See p. 338.

rests with the several Committees by whom they were prepared.

It was to be expected that the main trend and tenor of our deliberations would be taken, consciously or unconsciously, from that tendency of the Church's work, that conception of the Church's office, which is at the present time foremost in men's thoughts. By the word Church in this connection we mean the whole Society of Christian men throughout the world. We shall speak later of what belongs more distinctively to our own Communion. Different aspects of the Church and of its duty have been prominent in different epochs of Christian history; and according to this difference there has been a variation in the main current of men's interest and debate concerning the problems of the Church's life: now one class of problems, now another, has seemed inevitable, absorbing, supremely important in all assemblies of Christian people. It is therefore a significant fact that, when we review the work of this Conference, and ask what aspect or idea of the Church has been predominant in our deliberations, we find that through them all, in the many fields over which they have travelled, there has been ever present the thought of the Church as ordained of God for the service of mankind. How the Church, in the name of Him to whom all men are dear, may best serve for the true welfare and happiness of all—this, through all the diversity of detail, has been the constant theme of our study and discussion during the weeks which we have spent in the Conference and its Committees. Round this thought of Service the Resolutions which we have reached seem to take their place, grouped and correlated with a suggestive readiness of coherence.

It may be well to note with regard to this thought, first, that it is at the very centre of the Church's character as declared by our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; and, secondly, that in our day men are realising it with increasing clearness and intensity.

First, then, at the heart of that conception of the Church

which Christ our Lord has taught us is the thought of Service. For He came, "not to be ministered unto, but to minister"; and the Church is set to portray and to represent Him amongst men; to keep the vision of Him, of His work, His ways, before the eyes of men. Therefore the Church must take for its own this central note of His purpose and His Mission; the Church will be true to its calling in proportion as it can say to the world, by word and deed, by what it refuses and by what it claims, "I come, not to be ministered unto, but to minister": and it must be feared that the Church's forgetfulness of this, its obscuring or effacing of this essential characteristic, has at times disastrously hindered the world from recognising the true nature and office of the Church. The power to witness to Christ depends on being like Him. Men will always learn of Christ from those whom they see living with Christ-like simplicity, for their sake; the highest claim must be commended by the lowliest service; according to the bidding of our Saviour, who, "in the same night that He was betrayed," as He humbly ministered to His disciples' need, bequeathed to the Church an everlasting declaration of the duty and dignity of serving: "If I, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you. Verily, verily, I say unto you, The servant is not greater than his lord; neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him. If ye know these things happy are ye if ye do them."

Secondly: This function of service has been recognised with increasing clearness in recent years.

Doubtless there are many popular tendencies which cause us anxiety: the Reports which follow will mention some which call for urgent attention, and it would be unwise to belittle the importance of such tendencies; but it is the duty of faith to be on the watch for every token of good, and the courage of faith revives as we mark the widening and deepening influence of the spirit of Service. For the spirit of Service is awake. It inspires fresh

activities and increased devotion within the Church of Christ, and it extends to regions and to men who are outside the Church's borders.

It is seen, first, in the striking revival of missionary enterprise and zeal. By clear tokens we are made sure that the grace of God has stirred amongst us a truer sense of our duty towards those who have not heard the Gospel of Christ. The recognition of that duty and the desire to obey its call are shown in many ways: the multiplication of missionary organisations, though it has brought with it some fresh dangers, would not have gone forward had not the discernment of missionary obligation been growing in men's minds; while with unhindered gladness we must mark the evidence of that discernment in such new ventures as Medical Missions, and the increasing number of those who offer themselves for mission work. Nor can we fail to mark in this regard a significant change in the attitude and tone of general society. It can no longer seem necessary to talk apologetically of Missions. Their value in the spreading of true civilisation is attested by every statesman who has studied the subject, and numerous Reports, parliamentary and official, bear record of it. Lastly, we would point to the recent advance of movements such as the Student Volunteer Missionary Union; an advance which would, we believe, have been impossible but for that spirit of Service which under the guidance and blessing of God is now astir.

That spirit is seen again in the recognition of social responsibility. It has given new vitality to the traditional systems of our pastoral work. It has brought into existence new organisations, such as the Brotherhood of Saint Andrew and the Church of England Men's Society. And everywhere men and women are devoting themselves to work in those districts of our great cities where the problems and the distress of poverty still confront us with their urgent and awful claim. Women were first, and are still foremost, in the field; our generation has seen notable developments of the work of Sisterhoods, Deaconesses,

and District Nurses. It has seen the rise of "settlements," into which men and women bring their vigour and enthusiasm, their culture and capacity, to the service of their fellow men. Mention should also be made of efforts of another kind—Guilds of Social Service and Leagues such as the Christian Social Union. These are but some of the ways by which the spirit of Service is spreading far and wide. Not all who so work accept fully the claims of our Lord Jesus Christ; but we welcome them as witnesses to that ideal of life which the world owes to His teaching and inspiration, and which the Church, it must be admitted, has but slowly realised.

Thus in the revival of missionary enterprise and in the enlargement of the sphere of social obligation we mark the advance of larger and loftier conceptions of life. In all times of transition the sense of insecurity and confusion may threaten the quietness and confidence of faith; but we are sure that now, as in past ages of unsettlement and change, the creative Spirit of God is moving upon the face of the waters, and by many signs we recognise the presence and the work of Him who taught us by love to serve one another.

The same characteristic of the life and thought of our day strikes us as we turn from the widest survey of the Christian Society to the duty and the hope of our own Communion.

Fresh and clear in many minds is the witness borne in this regard by the Pan-Anglican Congress. The programme of the Congress was enough to show the eagerness of this spirit of Service in claiming for its own all spheres of useful work, but yet more remarkable and impressive was the tone of mind which prevailed in all the meetings. There was no faintness of heart in facing great questions, and no narrowness of mind in dealing with them. The genuine wish to work together swept away all thoughts of partisanship, and brought instead the reality of mutual understanding. Minds and hearts were lifted up on high, and as from the Mount of God men saw visions of Service.

In the Church's quickened sense of the truth that its calling cannot be fulfilled apart from the service of mankind, we see, beyond all clouds of difficulty and perplexity, the clear shining of a great hope. By the discernment of that truth the Church at once draws nearer to its Master, seeing further into the inexhaustible depths of His words and His example, and also finds itself in close instinctive sympathy with the best thoughts and aspirations in the social movements of our day. The field of service is as wide and various as the world. For wherever men are living and need help, whether the need be conscious or unconscious, thither the Church of the Christ Who took upon Him the form of a servant is beckoned by the opportunity of Service.

Round this central thought of Service, then, we group the Resolutions which we have passed. They bear upon the work, the methods, the organisation, the equipment, the adjustment of the efforts, the economy of the forces, the removal or the conquest of the hindrances of our Church as it goes forward in the service of mankind under the conditions of modern life. Further, we can group them in smaller clusters, as they concern the several divisions of the area in which men live their life, and wield their powers, and learn their need. The field of Service is as diverse as the realm of Law is shown to be in Richard Hooker's great portrayal of it; and as "the actions of men are of sundry distinct kinds," so in sundry distinct ways the Church of Christ can serve men. In two relations men are set to realise their life, their faculties, their being: in relation to Almighty God, as bound to Him by the quickening bond of His Fatherhood, which contains in itself their creation, their redemption, their sanctification; and in relation to their fellow men, as bound to them by sacred and essential bonds of brotherhood, realised in the home, in the State, and in the Church, which is "both a society and a society supernatural," leading men forward in the recognition and realisation both of their relation to Almighty God and of their relation one with another. By

these ways men may attain in communion with God, in communion with their brethren, to the fulness of personality and of life; in these ways, as they move onwards or hang back, the Church may serve and help them, and it is to the better rendering of that manifold service and help that we trust the outcome of our Conference may tend.

The Faith and Modern Thought.

We turn first to the subject of our faith in relation to the thought of the present day. In humble reverence and unalterable devotion we bow before the mystery of the Trinity in Unity, revealed indeed once for all, but revealing to each generation, and not least to our own, "new depths of the Divine." We bow before the mystery of God Incarnate in the Person of our Lord Jesus Christ, this, too, revealed once for all, but revealing to our times with novel clearness both God and man, and interpreting and confirming to us all that we have hoped or dreamed concerning union between them. We reaffirm the essential place of the historic facts stated by the Creeds in the structure of our faith. Many in our days have rashly denied the importance of these facts, but the ideas which these facts have in part generated and have always expressed cannot be dissociated from them. Without the historic Creeds the ideas would evaporate into unsubstantial vagueness, and Christianity would be in danger of degenerating into a nerveless altruism.

In the intellectual activity, the ferment of thought and the variety of opinion, which are characteristic of our day, we have in our holy faith not only a sure and steadfast anchor, but a centre of light which illumines the new truth and blends with the new light; for the new truth and new light are ultimately derived from the One Source of all truth and all light. We are bound therefore by our principles to look with confidence and hope on the progress of thought. But we mark in the present day special reasons for such confidence. Materialism has not for the

minds of our generation the strength or the attractiveness that once it had. Science displays in an unprecedented way the witness of nature to the wisdom of God. Men's minds are more and more set towards the spiritual, even when they are set away from Christianity. It is our duty, therefore, to contend the more earnestly for the truth once delivered to the Saints, which is the secret of life. And at the same time it is our duty to learn all that God is teaching us through the studies and discoveries of our contemporaries, whether inside or outside the Church, discerning indeed the spirits, whether they be of God, but bending with reverent teachableness to the influence of His Spirit, from whatever quarter He may breathe upon us.

But to meet the demands of such a time as ours, to appropriate its blessings, and to repel its dangers, there is need of a far greater effort on the part of the Church to deal with the intellectual side of religion and life.

As an illustration of such dealing with the intellectual conditions and speculative problems of our age we have commended to the attention of believers and seekers after truth the Report of our Committee on The Faith and Modern Thought.[1]

It is especially in regard to the rising generation that we would press the claims of this particular form of service. Whether we turn to the problems of Foreign Missions, especially in lands of ancient religions or philosophies, or to the problems which are continually arising amongst men of our own race in the new circumstances of our day, we find the same need of thinkers. We call upon Christian parents to whom God has given sons of any special ability to pray and to strive that these sons may contribute, whether as clergymen or laymen, to this great work. We appeal to those at school or in college who are coming to their strength to recognise this high call, and humbly to fit themselves by discipline of character, by intellectual sincerity, and by hard work, to bear their part in the formation and guidance of Christian thought.

[1] Resolutions 1 and 2 and p. 338.

Supply and Training of Clergy.

This call to parents and sons must be repeated on behalf of the Ministry. All over the English-speaking world we deplore the insufficiency of the number of men who are being ordained. Amongst the various reasons noted by our Committee for the lack of candidates, we are convinced that a main cause is to be found in the double fact of the attraction, even for the highest minds, now exerted by many other professions, and the inadequate provision which the Church makes for its clergy. We fear that many Christian parents hold back their sons from seeking Holy Orders because the worldly prospects of that sacred profession are bad. We appeal to such parents to consider whether their "prudence" is worthy of their Master. We call upon the Church to rise to a true conception of its duty of providing for the ministry. "The labourer is worthy of his hire." The dutifulness of Church-people ought to make their clergy sure of adequate stipends in their working days, and maintenance in old age. This is no proper call upon Christian "charity"; it is one of the first obligations of membership in the Church of Christ.

But we must take a larger view of this matter of ministry. The Church needs to realise in new ways the inherent priesthood of the Christian people. Much in the work of Education that in former times was done by the clergy is now done by laymen. We call upon all schoolmasters and all teachers in our Universities to remember the pastoral aspect of their office and to rise to the height of their high calling. On the other hand, much that might well be done by laymen is needlessly thrown upon the clergy. We call upon the laity to come forward, and upon the clergy to welcome their coming forward, for work of all kinds, and especially the financial and social work which properly belongs to them. But even after account has been taken of these actual or possible readjustments, we need more men for service in Holy Orders. We need all the men whom God is calling. He is calling men in

all conditions of life, poor as well as rich, unlearned as well as learned, the town-dweller and the countryman. But many are unable to obey the call for want of training or for want of means to obtain it. We would impress upon the faithful everywhere that the Church has to-day no greater need than that the clergy should be better trained, and that opportunities of good training should be made much more numerous. We rejoice to see new and promising endeavours to adapt the training of the clergy to differing circumstances and new conditions of labour. We would not relax, we would rather increase, our demands for a good general education. But this must be followed by training both in sacred knowledge and in practical wisdom if men are to become able ministers of the Word and Sacraments and true messengers, watchmen, and stewards of the Lord.

We hope that the training of the clergy may ever be regarded as only begun by preparation for Holy Orders. Lifelong study is of the very essence of the work of the priest, and he should be quick to avail himself of opportunities of new experience. In this connection, temporary exchanges of service by young clergymen between the different Churches of our Communion will be found to be invaluable in the training of ordained men, whether their main work is to be given in the old country or in newer lands.[1]

Education.

We commend to the Church the Resolutions which the Conference has passed on the subject of the Religious Education of the Young. As educators not less than as Christian leaders we desire to proclaim afresh our conviction that the aim of all true education is the development of the whole man to the highest perfection for which God intended him. We record our solemn protest and warning against any system of education which does not endeavour to fashion and upbuild the child's character in

[1] Resolutions 3–10 and p. 347.

the faith and fear of God. Wherever and however the child's "education" is carried on, that endeavour must find full place in it. As Christians we desire unswervingly to insist that the teachings of Holy Scripture must be the basis of all such work. We have reason to fear that the knowledge of the Bible may be ceasing to play the part which it once played in the training of the young, and that we may be in some danger of regarding lightly that which has in the Providence of God been for our race one of the great sources of stability and energy of character. But we do not rest here. In face of common misconception as to the real meaning of Bible teaching we have deemed it our duty to affirm that no teaching of the Bible can be regarded as adequate which does not steadily aim at inculcating personal holiness and a life of fellowship in the Church of Christ through the sanctifying grace of the Holy Ghost.

These thoughts we commend to all whom our words may reach, to all engaged in educational administration, to teachers, but above all to Christian parents. On parents rests the first and foremost responsibility, not only for teaching in the home itself, but also for influence upon the schools of their country. With regard to the high office of the teacher, we desire to lay stress upon the special call which comes to-day to young men and women to regard the teaching profession as one of the noblest to which God can call them, and to fit themselves for it by personal consecration of life and by thoughtful study in the light which by research and learning grows amongst us.

The question of due provision of secondary education under religious influences, wherever needed, is one that is pressed upon our Communion with increasing force, especially in the Colonies. There is a real danger lest by our failure to grasp the situation we should leave to other Communions the ground which we should ourselves be occupying, and thereby neglect a duty which we ought to fulfil in the interests of our own children.[1]

[1] Resolutions 11–19 and p. 367.

Foreign Missions.

The subject of Foreign Missions must always hold a foremost place among the questions which a Lambeth Conference is called to consider. We confidently believe that the Pan-Anglican Congress of this year has already taught our people to realise more vividly than ever before the direct obligation which in this matter God has laid upon every Christian man, and that the vivid interest of the problems—racial, philosophical, and practical—which the Church is now called upon to solve has in thousands of Christian homes been felt for the first time. In our Conference a large Committee of Bishops has been eagerly bringing to bear upon these problems the varied experience which is furnished from many lands. We commend to the Church the weighty words which they have spoken.

Two thoughts seem to emerge with a peculiar force from our consultations.

The first is the splendid hope that from the field of Foreign Missions there will be gathered for the enrichment of the Church's manifold heritage the ample and varied contribution of the special powers and characteristics belonging to the several nations of mankind. Each and all are capable of bringing within the apprehension of the Church aspects of truth as yet unrecognised. There is a harvest of the Spirit which cannot be garnered till the Spirit comes to breathe upon new types of humanity.

The solution of racial problems is the despair of statesmen. It is for the Church of God to face with quiet courage and with buoyant hope the perplexities which daunt the civil ruler who is striving to promote the peace and happiness of the world. The Church is ready with the old true message of the Gospel—"Ye are all one in Christ Jesus."

Secondly, there has come to us a deeper realisation of the imperative need that to the service of Foreign Missions we should offer of our very best. Money alone is but a poor thing to give with such an opportunity before us.

We need, we call for, men and women aflame with high enthusiasm for Christ, endowed with capacity, knowledge, and strength, and trained with eager and thoughtful care to discharge aright the noblest of all human responsibilities. At the same time we pray our brethren dwelling among non-Christian peoples to bear faithful witness to our Master, whose representatives, whether they remember it or not, those peoples will hold them to be.[1]

Prayer-Book.

A high part of the service which the Church of Christ has to render to men is to train and guide them in the worship of God, and in particular in public or common worship.

The growing experience of the Anglican Communion in different parts of the world and among different races has pointed to the necessity for the adaptation and enrichment of forms of service and worship which have come down to us from other times. Such adaptation and enrichment are advisable, and indeed essential if our Church is to meet the real needs of living men and women to-day. We have accordingly made certain practical suggestions in this direction which we commend to the attention of both clergy and laity.[2]

On the important subject of the *Quicunque vult* the result of very careful deliberations will be found in our Resolutions.[3]

Holy Communion.

The Resolutions which we have adopted with regard to the conditions requisite for the due administration of the Holy Communion bear simply upon two special difficulties which have been brought before us. The former of these two Resolutions will, we trust, allay what we believe to be an unnecessary apprehension of a risk of infection in the use of the chalice. We have affirmed our conviction

[1] Resolutions 20–26 and p. 372. [2] Resolutions 27 and 28.
[3] Resolutions 29 and 30 and p. 382.

that it would be unreasonable to make, on the ground of such apprehension, any departure from the traditional custom of the Church; and that the fears which have been unwisely roused should be allayed by the wisdom of common-sense. We advise that in special cases with exceptional circumstances the direction of the Bishop should be sought. The latter of the two Resolutions has regard to the past occurrence and the possible recurrence of cases involving an absolute necessity of choice between refraining altogether from the Celebration of the Holy Communion, or using for the Celebration wine which is not made from the fruit of the vine, or adopting some other usage inconsistent with Catholic order. We hold that the Church cannot sanction the use of any other elements than the Bread and Wine which the Lord commanded to be received; that, where the absolute necessity of which we have spoken is clear and unmistakable, the responsibility of deciding upon the right course must be left with those to whom it directly belongs; and that, if there be any deviation from the custom of the Church, such deviation should last no longer than while the absolute necessity prevails.[1]

Ministries of Healing.

Truths, which the Church has failed to set forth fully, have often given strength to the erroneous or disproportionate systems in which they have been emphasised; men have felt the force of teaching which has come to them as new; they have sometimes felt it all the more because it was urged upon them in severance from its context in the Christian creed. We hold that it is somewhat thus that a considerable influence has accrued in our day to certain movements which are described in the Report on Ministries of Healing. Those movements differ widely and deeply from one another in their character, and in the claim which they can make for consideration: we do not think it well here to speak of them in detail; they are

[1] Resolutions 31 and 32 and p. 388.

carefully estimated and characterised in the Report, which, with the Resolutions which we have passed,[1] indicates the manner in which, according to our judgment, they should be met.

We have also had before us the subject of the unction of the sick with a view to their recovery, and have considered it in regard to its history and to its alleged origin in the precept of St. James (v. 14), and also in relation to the conditions prevailing in the Church at the present time. As the result of our investigation, we do not recommend the authorisation of the anointing of the sick as a rite of the Church. On the other hand, we do not wish to forbid all recourse to a practice which, as we are informed, has been carried out by many persons, both clerical and lay, within and without our Communion. We have thought good to advise that the parish priest, in dealing with any request made to him by a sick person who humbly and heartily desires such anointing, should seek the counsel of his Bishop.[2]

Marriage Problems.

The purity of family life is the basis of all national stability; and it is the function of the Church not only to bless the marriage itself, but also to guard the integrity of the family in all its stages. In pursuance of this function it has been our duty to deal with evils arising from a low estimate of marriage, the unfaithfulness of married people to the vows by which they are bound, and the terrible increase of facilities for divorce. In the face of these and similar evils, we have felt it to be our duty to re-affirm the principles on the subject of divorce which were laid down by the Lambeth Conference twenty years ago,[3] and to assert our conviction that no view less strict than this is admissible in the Church of Christ. But we would lay especial stress upon the fact that it is in the

[1] Resolutions 33–35. [2] Resolution 36 and p. 390.
[3] See above p. 132.

realm of life more than in that of thought that evils of this kind are to be fought and overcome; and we would impress upon all our people the necessity for the formation of a pure and upright public opinion amongst women and men alike, which will not suffer the evils of which we speak to go on unchecked with impunity.

We are aware that upon some of the questions which have been raised on the subject of marriage we are speaking with less decision than may be expected, and that there are questions with regard to which we fail altogether to give such guidance as in some parts of our Communion is gravely needed. In so far as we have thus failed, it must be remembered that the Conference is gathered from Churches differing not only in the conditions under which they have to deal with these questions, but also in the formal Canons, diocesan, provincial, or general, by which their action is ruled. In view of this fact we have come to the conclusion that these questions must be dealt with separately in the several Churches of our Communion. We have on this ground left without an adequate or general declaration of judgment the difficulty which has been constituted for the Church of England by recent legislation concerning marriage with a deceased wife's sister.

A further evil with which we have had to deal is of such a kind that it cannot be spoken of without repugnance. No one who values the purity of home life can contemplate without grave misgiving the existence of an evil which jeopardises that purity; no one who treasures the Christian ideal of marriage can condone the existence of habits which subvert some of the essential elements of that ideal. In view of the figures and facts which have been set before us, we cannot doubt that there is a widespread prevalence amongst our peoples of the practice of resorting to artificial means for the avoidance or prevention of childbearing. We have spoken of these practices and endeavoured to characterise them as they deserve, not only in their results, but in themselves; and we would appeal to the members of our own Churches to

exert the whole force of their Christian character in condemnation of them.[1]

Moral Witness of the Church.

By the power of the truth which it carries and declares, the Church is constantly serving the cause of true progress. But it has a further duty to be watchfully responsive to the opportunities of service which the movements of civil society provide. The democratic movement of our century presents one of these opportunities. Underlying it are ideals of brotherhood, liberty, and mutual justice and help. In those ideals we recognise the working of our Lord's teaching as to the inestimable value of every human being in the sight of God, and His special thought for the weak and the oppressed. These are practical truths proclaimed by the ancient Prophets and enforced by our Lord with all the perfectness of His teaching and His life. We call upon the Church to consider how far and wherein it has departed from these truths. In so far as the democratic and industrial movement is animated by them and strives to procure for all, especially for the weaker, just treatment and a real opportunity of living a true human life, we appeal to all Christians to co-operate actively with it. Only so can they hope to commend to the movement the Spirit of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is at once its true stimulus and its true corrective. Only so can they win for Him that allegiance which is the constant and enduring security for the hopes and progress of human society.[2]

Three subjects of pressing importance, on which the Conference did not appoint Committees, it treated in Resolutions.

The neglect of Sunday we are bound to resist with all the force of corporate opposition in the interest both of the service of God and of the service of man.[3]

As servants of the Prince of Peace we welcome the efforts

[1] Resolutions 37–43 and p. 395. [2] Resolutions 44–50. [3] Resolution 53.

which have been made in the Conferences at The Hague to vindicate the methods of peace and to promote arbitration in the affairs of nations; and we desire to record our conviction that the conflicts inevitably arising from race prejudice, from commercial rivalry, and from competing trade-interests can best be brought to an end by a resolute use of arbitration and similar methods.[1]

The service of man demands that we should vigorously support efforts to cut off the occasions of stumbling which bring thousands of lives to disaster. Such a purpose dictates our Resolution on the subject of Opium, in which we express our hearty sympathy with all that Governments and individuals are attempting for the abatement of that great evil.[2]

In like manner the growth and expansion of the liquor traffic in West Africa, to the infinite detriment of its peoples, seems to us to be an evil which calls imperatively for redress.[3]

No one can watch the life of our day without noting many gigantic forces of evil active among us, of which intemperance, impurity and gambling are signal examples. Some of these have been the subjects of detailed treatment by earlier Conferences; others may be dealt with by those that follow. But we are persuaded that we shall not strengthen the moral witness of the Church by attempting to deal cursorily on each occasion with all, even of the most important subjects. We only desire to make it evident that if we must perforce omit many subjects of ever pressing importance, it is not through inadvertence, or because we are not zealous to encourage those whom we address to unremitting and prayerful efforts in combating the manifold forces of evil which are working havoc in the human life around us.[4]

Organisation.

In the next set of Resolutions we have dealt with matters which, though more limited in their range, are of practical and even of vital importance.

[1] Resolution 52. [2] Resolution 51. [3] Resolution 50. [4] See p. 409.

If the Anglican Communion is to render that service to the varied needs of mankind to which the Church of our day is specially called, regard must be had both to the just freedom of its several parts and to the just claims of the whole Communion upon its every part.

That freedom of local development which is a characteristic element in the inheritance which the Anglican Communion has received, and in the traditions of the English-speaking race, and which also belongs of right to the native churches which we have fostered, must have its balance and check in opportunities for mutual consultation and advice.

To this end we have recommended the reconstruction upon representative lines of the Central Consultative Body, which was initiated by the Conference of 1897[1]; we have suggested methods for the election of its members, and principles which ought at once to guide and to limit its action.[2]

Reunion.

There is no subject of more general or more vivid interest than that of Reunion and Intercommunion. This interest indeed is not new. The peculiar position of our Communion, with its power and hope of mediating in a divided Christendom, has long been recognised by members of our own Churches and by others. This position is to us a continual call to service, as was abundantly acknowledged by the Conferences of 1888 and 1897. But this year's Conference has met in circumstances which pressed upon us this same call to service with a new insistence. The winning of the nations to Christ, in fulfilment of His own great commission to His Church, is a matter of much more general concern to Christian people than ever before, and we realise the imperative necessity for effective and visible co-operation among the workers. The

[1] See above pp. 187, 199, 213–214. [2] Resolutions 54–56 and p. 415.

waste of force in the Mission field calls aloud for unity. Nor is this less necessary for the effective conduct of the war against the mighty forces of evil in Christian lands. With the realisation of this need has come a new demand for unity, a penitent acknowledgment of the faults that hinder it, and a quickened eagerness in prayer that, through the mercy of God, it may be attained.

The careful Report of our Committee and the detailed Resolutions may seem to some but cold in comparison with the warmth of the desires of many hearts. But these readers should remember the grave responsibility which attaches to the composition of such documents, and the necessity of accuracy, candour, and self-restraint, if the cause of unity is to be advanced by them.

Such Resolutions and Reports cannot be summarised; they must be studied. It will be observed that, in regard to every one of the Churches or groups of Churches to which our attention has been directed, we have tried to indicate some lines of definite practical approach. Wherever we have had reason to think that such an advance would be welcomed, we have gone far to meet our brethren. Where we have felt it absolutely necessary to sound a note of warning, we have tried to speak the truth in love.

Our Resolutions represent, for the most part, the present situation of our public relations with churches more or less widely separated from us. They may seem to show the remoteness rather than the nearness of corporate reunion. But before that consummation can be reached there must come a period of preparation. This preparation must be made by individuals in many ways, by co-operation in moral and social endeavour and in promoting the spiritual interests of mankind, by brotherly intercourse, by becoming familiar with one another's characteristic beliefs and practices, by the increase of mutual understanding and appreciation. All this will be fruitful in proportion as it is dominated by a right ideal of reunion. We must set before us the Church of Christ as He would

have it, one spirit and one body, enriched with all those elements of divine truth which the separated communities of Christians now emphasise severally, strengthened by the interaction of all the gifts and graces which our divisions now hold asunder, filled with all the fulness of God. We dare not, in the name of peace, barter away those precious things of which we have been made stewards. Neither can we wish others to be unfaithful to trusts which they hold no less sacred. We must fix our eyes on the Church of the future, which is to be adorned with all the precious things, both theirs and ours. We must constantly desire not compromise but comprehension, not uniformity but unity.[1]

The work of our Lambeth Conferences is gradually assuming a certain measure of continuity or sequence. This may be illustrated by the fact that we have had before us the Report of a Committee appointed in the Lambeth Conference of 1897 to consider the relations of religious communities within the Church to the Episcopate, and we have requested the Archbishop of Canterbury to take steps for ascertaining and comparing the opinions of different parts of the Church in regard to this subject, nowadays increasingly important.[2]

Similarly we have now requested the Archbishop of Canterbury to appoint Committees to consider and report upon the following subjects: The best method of improving the instruction given in Sunday Schools; the preparation of a new translation of the *Quicunque vult*; and the compilation of a book containing additional forms of service which might be authorised by particular Bishops for use in their Dioceses.[3]

We have, moreover, had again before us questions concerning our relations with the separate Churches of the East; we have received with a hearty welcome a letter of friendly greeting brought to us from the Archbishop of Upsala by the Bishop of Kalmar; and we have again entered carefully into the history and position of the

[1] Resolutions 58–78. [2] Resolution 57. [3] Resolutions 14, 29, 28.

Unitas Fratrum, better known as the Moravian Brethren. In all these cases the Archbishop of Canterbury has been asked to appoint Commissions to inquire further into the questions which are involved.[1]

We have also recommended the appointment of a permanent Committee of men specially conversant with the life and doctrine of the Churches of the Orthodox East, to take cognisance of all that concerns our relation to those Churches.[2]

Such is the outcome of our work; and our hope is that it may, by the blessing of God, tend to uphold, confirm, and guide the will of Christ's servants by love to serve one another after His example and for His sake. The brightness of His light is on the scene before us as we think of the Church thus showing forth in the world with ever-increasing clearness the glory and happiness of service. But the vision is not bounded by the horizon of the world; its true meaning is not known until we raise our eyes above the scenes of time. God made us for Himself: and the purpose of His love for every individual soul and for the whole race of mankind cannot be attained or understood until all that He has given and redeemed is lifted up in glad and thankful offering to Him. Human life at large and the lives of men, one by one, find their true calling and the earnest of their everlasting joy through self-oblation in union with Him who made for all men the One Perfect Oblation of Himself. That men may know that calling, that they may come to that joy, is the end, the crown, of all the service that the Church can render to them. The goal may seem far off; the glory that shall be revealed may seem more than our thoughts can grasp; but the Church can never be content with a lower aim than the hope which God has given, and all things are possible with Him who is Almighty and Eternal. Those who believe that in the service of mankind they are fellow-workers with Him must not fear to lift their hope and

[1] Resolutions 63, 64, 74, 73. [2] Resolution 61 and p 420.

prayer for all men to the height towards which He points; even that we may "present every man perfect in Christ Jesus"; even that "all may come unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."

Signed on behalf of the Conference,

RANDALL CANTUAR:

G. W. BATH: AND WELL:
Registrar.

G. R. WAKEFIELD
H. H. MONTGOMERY (Bishop)
E. GRAHAM INGHAM (Bishop)
} *Secretaries.*

August 5th, 1908.

XVII.

RESOLUTIONS FORMALLY ADOPTED BY THE CONFERENCE OF 1908. (See p. 45.)

1. The Conference commends to Christian people and to all seekers after truth the Report of the Committee on The Faith and Modern Thought, as a faithful attempt to show how that claim of our Lord Jesus Christ, which the Church is set to present to each generation, may, under the characteristic conditions of our time, best command allegiance.[1]

2. The Conference, in view of tendencies widely shown in the writings of the present day, hereby places on record its conviction that the historical facts stated in the Creeds are an essential part of the Faith of the Church.

---

3. Whereas our Lord Jesus Christ and His Apostles made it of first importance that the Church's ministers should be men of spiritual character and power, full of faith and of the Holy Ghost; and whereas our Lord has taught us to pray to the Lord of the harvest that He will send forth labourers into His harvest; this Conference desires to emphasise the need of more earnest prayer on the part of the Church generally, especially at the Ember seasons, that God would call and send forth such men to the work of the ministry.

4. Whereas, in view of the serious decline in the number of candidates for Holy Orders, it is clear that some do not recognise that call and others are either unwilling or unable to offer themselves for the ministry, we recommend

[1] See p. 338.

that Christian parents be urged to encourage signs of vocation in their sons, and to count it a privilege to dedicate them for the ministry, and parish priests and teachers in schools and universities to foster such vocations.

5. Inasmuch as there are many young men who appear to have a vocation for the ministry and to be hindered from realising it only by lack of means to provide their training, this Conference urges that an Ordination Candidates Fund and Committee, or some similar organisation, should form part of the normal equipment of the Church, to assist Bishops in discovering such men and enabling them to respond to their call; and that all Churchmen should be taught to regard it as their duty to contribute to this object.

6. So far from the standard for ordination being lowered to meet the existing deficiency in the number of candidates, the time has now come when, in view of the development of education and of the increased opportunities afforded for university training, a serious effort should be made to secure that candidates for Holy Orders should normally be graduates of some recognised university.

7. While rules must of necessity vary to suit the varying conditions in different parts of the world, the principle ought everywhere to be maintained that, in addition to general education, all candidates should be required to receive special theological and practical training under some recognised supervision.

8. It is of the greatest importance that the conscience of the Church at large should be awakened as to its primary responsibility for providing for the training, maintenance, and superannuation of the clergy; and we recommend that united action to this end should be taken, where possible, by the provinces or national churches of our Communion.

9. Since it is generally acknowledged that the system of encouraging men to work abroad for a period of three or five years has proved successful, it should be continued

and carried out more thoroughly and systematically, and a greater reciprocity of service might be established to the benefit of all concerned.

10. In view of the embarrassment arising from the lack of uniform usage regulating the transfer of clergymen from one Diocese to another, it is necessary that none should be received into a Diocese or missionary jurisdiction of the Anglican Communion until the Bishop of the Diocese into which he goes has received concerning him, in addition to whatever other Letters Testimonial may be required, a direct communication or a letter of transfer from the Bishop of the Diocese from which he comes.

---

11. In the judgment of the Conference it is our duty as Christians to make it clear to the world that purely secular systems of education are educationally as well as morally unsound, since they fail to co-ordinate the training of the whole nature of the child, and necessarily leave many children deficient in a most important factor for that formation of character which is the principal aim of education.

12. It is our duty as Christians to maintain that the true end of Bible-teaching is a sound and definite Christian faith, realising itself in a holy life of obedience and love, and of fellowship in the Church of Christ through the sanctifying grace of the Holy Ghost; and no teaching can be regarded as adequate religious teaching which limits itself to historical information and moral culture.

13. It is our duty as Christians to be alert to use in all schools every opportunity which the State affords us for training our children in the faith of their parents, and to obtain adequate opportunities for such teaching in countries where they do not already exist.

14. There is urgent need to strengthen our Sunday School system, and the Archbishop of Canterbury is respectfully requested to appoint a committee to report to him on the best methods of improving Sunday School instruction, and on the right relations between Sunday

Schools and the various systems of catechising in church.

15. It is of vital importance that the Church should establish and maintain secondary schools, wherever they are needed, for children of the English-speaking race in all parts of the Anglican Communion; and the Conference earnestly supports the plea which reaches it for the establishment of such schools.

16. The Conference draws attention to the pressing need of the services of men and women who will consecrate their lives to teaching as a call from the Great Head of the Church.

17. The religious training of teachers should be regarded as a primary duty of the Church, especially in view of the right use to be made of the light thrown on the Bible by modern research; and teachers should be encouraged in all their efforts to associate themselves for the promotion of their spiritual life.

18. The Church should endeavour to promote and cultivate the spiritual life of the students in secondary schools and universities, and should show active sympathy with all wisely directed efforts which have this end in view.

19. The Conference desires to lay special stress on the duty of parents in all conditions of social life to take personal part in the religious instruction of their own children, and to show active interest in the religious instruction which the children receive at school.

---

20. All races and peoples, whatever their language or conditions, must be welded into one Body, and the organisation of different races living side by side into separate or independent Churches, on the basis of race or colour, is inconsistent with the vital and essential principle of the unity of Christ's Church.

21. Every effort should be made to train native churches and congregations in self-support and self-government; and in view of the great importance of the establishment of a native episcopate in all countries where the Church

is planted, this Conference urges the necessity of providing an advanced theological and practical training for the ablest of the native clergy in the Mission field.

22. This Conference reaffirms Resolution 24[1] of the Conference of 1897 and further resolves that, though it may be desirable to recognise, in some cases and under certain special circumstances, the episcopal care of a Bishop for his own countrymen within the jurisdiction of another Bishop of the Anglican Communion, yet the principle of one Bishop for one area is the ideal to be aimed at as the best means of securing the unity of all races and nations in the Holy Catholic Church.

23. The Conference commends to the consideration of the Church the suggestions of the Committee on Foreign Missions, contained in their Report, for correlation and co-operation between Missions of the Anglican Communion and those of other Christian bodies.[2]

24. While the educative value of the Book of Common Prayer and the importance of retaining it as a bond of union and standard of devotion should be fully recognised, every effort should be made, under due authority, to render the forms of public worship more intelligible to uneducated congregations and better suited to the widely diverse needs of the various races within the Anglican Communion.

25. National and local Churches are at liberty to adopt native forms of marriage and consecrate them to a Christian use, provided that—

[1] Resolution 24 of the Lambeth Conference, 1897: "That, while it is the duty of the whole Church to make disciples of all nations, yet, in the discharge of this duty, independent Churches of the Anglican Communion ought to recognise the equal rights of each other when establishing foreign missionary jurisdictions, so that two Bishops of that Communion may not exercise jurisdiction in the same place, and the Conference recommends every Bishop to use his influence in the diocesan and provincial synods of his particular Church to gain the adhesion of the synods to these principles, with a view to the framing of canons or resolutions in accord therewith. When such rights have, through inadvertence, been infringed in the past, an adjustment of the respective positions of the Bishops concerned ought to be made by an amicable arrangement between them, with a view to correcting as far as possible the evils arising from such infringement."

[2] See p. 378.

(*a*) The form used explicitly states that the marriage is lifelong and exclusive;

(*b*) The form is free from all heathen and idolatrous taint;

(*c*) Provision is made for the due registration of the marriage, and for other formalities according to the law of the land.

26. This Conference also desires to express its deep sense of the missionary value of the recent Pan-Anglican Congress; and commends to the careful study of the whole Anglican Communion the solemn facts of duty, opportunity, and responsibility, in regard to the non-Christian world, which that Congress elicited and affirmed.

---

27. In any revision of the Book of Common Prayer which may hereafter be undertaken by competent authority the following principles should be held in view:—

(*a*) The adaptation of rubrics in a large number of cases to present customs as generally accepted;

(*b*) The omission of parts of the services to obviate repetition or redundancy;

(*c*) The framing of additions to the present services in the way of enrichment;

(*d*) The fuller provision of alternatives in our forms of public worship;

(*e*) The provision for greater elasticity in public worship;

(*f*) The change of words obscure or commonly misunderstood;

(*g*) The revision of the Calendar and Tables prefixed to the Book of Common Prayer.

28. The Conference requests the Archbishop of Canterbury to take counsel with such persons as he may see fit to consult, with a view to the preparation of a Book containing special forms of service, which might be authorised by particular Bishops for use in their Dioceses, so far as they may consider it possible and desirable.

29. Without in any sense precluding the further consideration by the several Churches of our Communion of the mode of dealing with the *Quicunque vult*, it is desirable that a new translation be made, based upon the best Latin text; and the Archbishop of Canterbury is requested to take such steps as are necessary for providing such a translation.

30. The Conference, having had under consideration the liturgical use of the *Quicunque vult*, expresses its opinion that, inasmuch as the use or disuse of this Hymn is not a term of Communion, the several Churches of the Anglican Communion may rightly decide for themselves what in their varying circumstances is desirable; but the Conference urges that, if any change of rule or usage is made, full regard should be had to the maintenance of the Catholic Faith in its integrity, to the commendation of that Faith to the minds of men, and to the relief of disquieted consciences.

---

31. For reasons given in the Report on the Administration of Holy Communion,[1] as well as for other reasons, the Conference is convinced that it is not desirable to make, on the ground of alarm as to the possible risk of infection, any change in the manner of administering the Holy Communion. Special cases involving exceptional risk should be referred to the Bishop and dealt with according to his direction.

32. The Conference declares that the only Elements which the Church can sanction for use in the administration of the Holy Communion are Bread and Wine, according to the institution of our Lord. While declaring this, the Conference does not pronounce judgment upon such a course as in cases of absolute necessity may be in particular regions adopted by those Bishops on whom falls the responsibility of dealing with an imperative need. But it would insist that any such divergence from the practice of the Church, if it is to be justified by actual necessity,

[1] See p. 388.

ought to cease as soon as the conditions of necessity are over.

---

33. With regard to the Ministries of Healing, this Conference, confident that God has infinite blessings and powers in store for those who seek them by prayer, communion, and strong endeavour, and conscious that the clergy and laity of the Church have too often failed to turn to God with such complete trust as will draw those powers into full service, desires solemnly to affirm that the strongest and most immediate call to the Church is to the deepening and renewal of her spiritual life; and to urge upon the Clergy of the Church so to set forth to the people Christ, the Incarnate Son of God, and the truth of His abiding Presence in the Church and in Christian souls by the Holy Spirit, that all may realise and lay hold of the power of the indwelling Spirit to sanctify both soul and body, and thus, through a harmony of man's will with God's will, to gain a fuller control over temptation, pain, and disease, whether for themselves or others, with a firmer serenity and a more confident hope.

34. With a view to resisting dangerous tendencies in contemporary thought, the Conference urges the Clergy in their dealings with the sick to teach as clearly as possible the privilege of those who are called, through sickness and pain, to enter especially into the fellowship of Christ's sufferings and to follow the example of His patience.

35. The Conference recommends the provision for use in Pastoral Visitation of some additional prayers for the restoration of health more hopeful and direct than those contained in the present Office for the Visitation of the Sick, and refers this recommendation to the Committee to be appointed by the President under the Resolution on the subject of Prayer Book enrichment.

36. The Conference, having regard to the uncertainty which exists as to the permanence of the practice commended by St. James (v. 14), and having regard to the

history of the practice which professes to be based upon that commendation, does not recommend the sanctioning of the anointing of the sick as a rite of the Church.

It does not, however, advise the prohibition of all anointing, if anointing be earnestly desired by the sick person. In all such cases the Parish Priest should seek the counsel of the Bishop of the Diocese. Care must be taken that no return be made to the later custom of anointing as a preparation for death.

---

37. The growing prevalence of disregard of the sanctity of marriage calls for the active and determined co-operation of all right-thinking and clean-living men and women, in all ranks of life, in defence of the family life and the social order, which rest upon the sanctity of the marriage tie.

38. The influence of all good women in all ranks of life should be specially applied to the remedying of the terrible evils which have grown up from the creation of facilities for divorce.

39. This Conference reaffirms the resolution of the Conference of 1888 as follows:—

"(A) That, inasmuch as our Lord's words expressly forbid divorce, except in case of fornication or adultery, the Christian Church cannot recognise divorce in any other than the excepted case, or give any sanction to the marriage of any person who has been divorced contrary to this law, during the life of the other party.

"(B) That under no circumstances ought the guilty party, in the case of a divorce for fornication or adultery, to be regarded, during the lifetime of the innocent party, as a fit recipient of the blessing of the Church on marriage.

"(C) That, recognising the fact that there always has been a difference of opinion in the Church on the question whether our Lord meant to forbid marriage to the innocent party in a divorce for adultery, the Conference recommends that the clergy should not be instructed to refuse

the Sacraments or other privileges of the Church to those who, under civil sanction, are thus married."

40. When an innocent person has, by means of a court of law, divorced a spouse for adultery, and desires to enter into another contract of marriage, it is undesirable that such a contract should receive the blessing of the Church.

[Carried by 87 votes to 84.]

41. The Conference regards with alarm the growing practice of the artificial restriction of the family, and earnestly calls upon all Christian people to discountenance the use of all artificial means of restriction as demoralising to character and hostile to national welfare.

42. The Conference affirms that deliberate tampering with nascent life is repugnant to Christian morality.

43. The Conference expresses most cordial appreciation of the services rendered by those medical men who have borne courageous testimony against the injurious practices spoken of, and appeals with confidence to them and to their medical colleagues to co-operate in creating and maintaining a wholesome public opinion on behalf of the reverent use of the married state.

---

44. The Conference recognises the ideals of brotherhood which underlie the democratic movement of this century; and, remembering our Master's example in proclaiming the inestimable value of every human being in the sight of God, calls upon the Church to show sympathy with the movement, in so far as it strives to procure just treatment for all and a real opportunity of living a true human life, and by its sympathy to commend to the movement the spirit of our Lord Jesus Christ, in whom all the hopes of human society are bound up.

45. The social mission and social principles of Christianity should be given a more prominent place in the study and teaching of the Church, both for the clergy and the laity.

46. The ministry of the laity requires to be more widely recognised, side by side with the ministry of the clergy,

in the work, the administration, and the discipline of the Church.

47. A committee or organisation for social service should be part of the equipment of every Diocese, and, as far as practicable, of every parish.

48. The Church should teach that the Christian who is an owner of property should recognise the governing principle that, like all our gifts, our powers and our time, property is a trust held for the benefit of the community, and its right use should be insisted upon as a religious duty.

49. The Conference urges upon members of the Church practical recognition of the moral responsibility involved in their investments. This moral responsibility extends to—

(*a*) The character and general social effect of any business or enterprise in which their money is invested;

(*b*) The treatment of the persons employed in that business or enterprise;

(*c*) The due observance of the requirements of the law relating thereto;

(*d*) The payment of a just wage to those who are employed therein.

50. The Conference holds that it is the duty of the Church to press upon Governments the wrong of sanctioning for the sake of revenue any forms of trade which involve the degradation or hinder the moral and physical progress of the races and peoples under their rule or influence.

51. The Conference, regarding the non-medicinal use of opium as a grave physical and moral evil, welcomes all well-considered efforts to abate such use, particularly those of the Government and people of China, and also the proposal of the Government of the United States to arrange an International Commission on Opium. It thankfully recognises the progressive reduction by the Indian Government of the area of poppy cultivation, but still appeals for all possible insistence on the affirmation of the

House of Commons that the Indian opium traffic with China is morally indefensible. It urges a stringent dealing with the opium vice in British Settlements, along with due precautions against the introduction of narcotic substitutes for opium. Finally, it calls upon all Christian people to pray for the effectual repression of the opium evil.

52. The Conference, while frankly acknowledging the moral gains sometimes won by war, rejoices in the growth of higher ethical perceptions which is evidenced by the increasing willingness to settle difficulties among nations by peaceful methods; it records, therefore, its deep appreciation of the services rendered by the Conferences at The Hague, its thankfulness for the practical work achieved, and for the principles of international responsibility acknowledged by the delegates; and, finally, realising the dangers inseparable from national and commercial progress, it urges earnestly upon all Christian peoples the duty of allaying race-prejudice, of reducing by peaceful arrangements the conflict of trade interests, and of promoting among all races the spirit of brotherly co-operation for the good of all mankind.

53. The Conference desires to call attention to the evidence supplied from every part of Christendom as to the grave perils arising from the increasing disregard of the religious duties and privileges which are attached to a due observance, both on the social and spiritual side, of the Christian Sunday. In consequence of this, the Conference records its solemn conviction that strong and co-ordinated action is urgently demanded, with a view to educating the public conscience and forming a higher sense of individual responsibility alike on the religious and humanitarian aspects of the question.

The Conference further, in pursuance of the Resolutions passed upon this subject in former Conferences, calls upon Christian people to promote by all means in their power the better observance of the Lord's Day, both on land and sea, for the worship of God and for the spiritual, mental, and physical health of man.

54. The existing Central Consultative Body shall be reconstructed on representative lines as follows:—

(*a*) It shall consist of the Archbishop of Canterbury (*ex officio*) and of representative Bishops appointed as follows: Province of Canterbury 2, Province of York 1, the Church of Ireland 1, the Episcopal Church in Scotland 1, the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America 4, the Church of England in Canada 1, the Church of England in the Dioceses of Australia and Tasmania 1, the Church of the Province of New Zealand 1, the Province of the West Indies 1, the Church of the Province of South Africa 1, the Province of India and Ceylon 1, the Dioceses of China and Corea and the Church of Japan 1, the missionary and other extra-provincial Bishops under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Canterbury 1. Total 18.

(*b*) The foregoing scheme of representation shall be open to revision from time to time by the Lambeth Conference.

(*c*) The mode of appointing these representative Bishops shall be left to the churches that appoint. A representative Bishop may be appointed for one year or for any number of years, and need not be a member of the body which appoints him. Each member shall retain office until the election of his successor has been duly notified to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

(*d*) For the purpose of appointing the Bishop who is to represent the body of missionary and other extra-provincial Bishops under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Canterbury, each of those Bishops shall be requested by the Archbishop of Canterbury to nominate a Bishop to him. The list of Bishops so nominated shall be then sent to all the Bishops entitled to vote, and each of them shall, if he thinks fit to vote, send to the Archbishop the name of the one in that list for whom he votes. The largest number of votes shall carry the election.

55. The Central Consultative Body shall be prepared to receive consultative communications from any Bishop, but shall, in considering them, have careful regard to any

limitations upon such references which may be imposed by provincial regulation.

56. The Consultative Body shall not at any meeting come to a decision on any subject not named in the notice summoning the meeting.

---

57. That the Archbishop of Canterbury be requested to transmit to every Diocesan Bishop in the Anglican Communion a copy of the Final Report of the Committee appointed by the Conference of 1897 to consider the relation of Religious Communities within the Church to the Episcopate, accompanying it with a request that it may be duly considered, and that each Province of the Anglican Communion will, if it consents to do so, send to him, through its Metropolitan, before July 31st, 1910, a statement of the judgment formed in that Province upon the subject dealt with in the Report.[1]

---

58. This Conference reaffirms the resolution of the Conference of 1897 that "Every opportunity should be taken to emphasise the Divine purpose of visible unity amongst Christians as a fact of revelation."[2] It desires further to affirm that in all partial projects of reunion and intercommunion the final attainment of the divine purpose should be kept in view as our object; and that care should be taken to do what will advance the reunion of the whole of Christendom, and to abstain from doing anything that will retard or prevent it.

59. The Conference recognises with thankfulness the manifold signs of the increase of the desire for unity among all Christian bodies; and, with a deep sense of the call to follow the manifest guiding of the Holy Spirit, solemnly urges the duty of special intercession for the unity of the Church, in accordance with our Lord's own prayer.

---

[1] See p. 440.

[2] See p. 205.

60. This Conference resolves that a letter of greeting be sent from the Lambeth Conference to the National Council of the Russian Church about to assemble, and that the letter should be conveyed to the Council by two or more Bishops if possible; and that His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury be respectfully requested to cause such a letter to be written, and to sign it on behalf of the Conference, and to nominate Bishops to convey it to the Council.

61. The Conference respectfully requests the Archbishop of Canterbury to appoint a Committee to take cognisance of all that concerns our relations with the Churches of the Orthodox East, and desires that this Committee should be on a permanent basis.

62. The Conference is of opinion that it should be the recognised practice of the Churches of our Communion (1) at all times to baptize the children of members of any Church of the Orthodox Eastern Communion in cases of emergency, provided that there is a clear understanding that baptism should not be again administered to those so baptized; (2) at all times to admit members of any Church of the Orthodox Eastern Communion to communicate in our churches, when they are deprived of the ministrations of a priest of their own Communion, provided that (*a*) they are at that time admissible to Communion in their own Churches, and (*b*) are not under any disqualification so far as our own rules of discipline are concerned.

---

63. The Conference would welcome any steps that might be taken to ascertain the precise doctrinal position of the ancient separate Churches of the East with a view to possible intercommunion, and would suggest to the Archbishop of Canterbury the appointment of Commissions to examine the doctrinal position of particular Churches, and (for example) to prepare some carefully framed statement of the Faith as to our Lord's Person, in the simplest possible terms, which should be submitted to each of such Churches, where feasible, in order to ascertain whether it

represents their belief with substantial accuracy. The conclusions of such Commissions should in our opinion be submitted to the Metropolitans or Presiding Bishops of all the Churches of the Anglican Communion.

64. In the event of doctrinal agreement being reached with such separate Churches, the Conference is of opinion that it would be right (1) for any Church of the Anglican Communion to admit individual communicant members of those Churches to communicate with us when they are deprived of this means of grace through isolation, and conversely, for our communicants to seek the same privileges in similar circumstances; (2) for the Churches of the Anglican Communion to permit our communicants to communicate on special occasions with these Churches, even when not deprived of this means of grace through isolation, and conversely, that their communicants should be allowed the same privileges in similar circumstances.

65. We consider that any more formal and complete compact between us and any such Church, seeing that it might affect our relations with certain other Churches, should not take place without previous communication with any other Church which might be affected thereby.

---

66. The Conference is of opinion that it is of the greatest importance that our representatives abroad, both clerical and lay, whilst holding firmly to our own position, should show all Christian courtesy towards the Churches of the lands in which they reside and towards their ecclesiastical authorities; and that the chaplains to be selected for work on the continent of Europe and elsewhere should be instructed to show such courtesy.

67. We desire earnestly to warn members of our Communion against contracting marriages with Roman Catholics under the conditions imposed by modern Roman canon law, especially as these conditions involve the performance of the marriage ceremony without any prayer or invocation of the divine blessing, and also a promise to

have their children brought up in a religious system which they cannot themselves accept.

---

68. The Conference desires to maintain and strengthen the friendly relations which already exist between the Churches of the Anglican Communion and the ancient Church of Holland and the old Catholic Churches, especially in Germany, Switzerland, and Austria.

69. With a view to the avoidance of further ecclesiastical confusion, the Conference would earnestly deprecate the setting up of a new organised body in regions where a Church with apostolic ministry and Catholic doctrine offers religious privileges without the imposition of uncatholic terms of communion, more especially in cases where no difference of language or nationality exists; and, in view of the friendly relations referred to in the previous Resolution, it would respectfully request the Archbishop of Canterbury, if he thinks fit, to bring this Resolution to the notice of the Old Catholic Bishops.

---

70. For the sake of unity, and as a particular expression of brotherly affection, we recommend that any official request of the *Unitas Fratrum* for the participation of Anglican Bishops in the consecration of Bishops of the *Unitas* should be accepted, provided that

(i) Such Anglican Bishops should be not less than three in number, and should participate both in the saying of the Prayers of Consecration and in the laying on of hands, and that the rite itself is judged to be sufficient by the Bishops of the Church of our Communion to which the invited Bishops belong;

(ii) The Synods of the *Unitas* (*a*) are able to give sufficient assurance of doctrinal agreement with ourselves in all essentials (as we believe that they will be willing and able to do); and (*b*) are willing to explain its position as that of a religious community or missionary

body in close alliance with the Anglican Communion; and (*c*) are willing to accord a due recognition to the position of our Bishops within Anglican Dioceses and jurisdictions; and (*d*) are willing to adopt a rule as to the administration of Confirmation more akin to our own.

71. After the conditions prescribed in the preceding Resolution have been complied with, and a Bishop has been consecrated in accordance with them, corresponding invitations from any Bishop of the *Unitas Fratrum* to an Anglican Bishop and his Presbyters to participate in the ordination of a Moravian Presbyter should be accepted, provided that the Anglican Bishop should participate both in the saying of the prayers of ordination and in the laying on of hands, and that the rite itself is judged to be sufficient by the Bishops of the Church of our Communion to which the invited Bishop belongs.

72. Any Bishop or Presbyter so consecrated or ordained should be free to minister in the Anglican Communion with due episcopal licence; and, in the event of the above proposals—*i.e.* Resolutions 1 and 2—being accepted and acted upon by the Synods of the *Unitas*, during the period of transition some permission to preach in our churches might on special occasions be extended to Moravian Ministers by Bishops of our Communion.

73. We recommend that the Archbishop of Canterbury be respectfully requested to name a committee to communicate, as need arises, with representatives of the *Unitas*, and also to direct that the decisions of the present Conference be communicated to the *Secretarius Unitatis*.

---

74. This Conference heartily thanks the Archbishop of Upsala for his letter of friendly greeting, and for sending his honoured colleague, the Bishop of Kalmar, to confer with its members on the question of the establishment of an alliance of some sort between the Swedish and Anglican

Churches. The Conference respectfully desires the Archbishop of Canterbury to appoint a Commission to correspond further with the Swedish Church through the Archbishop of Upsala on the possibility and conditions of such an alliance.

---

75. The Conference receives with thankfulness and hope the Report of its Committee on Reunion and Intercommunion,[1] and is of opinion that, in the welcome event of any project of reunion between any Church of the Anglican Communion and any Presbyterian or other non-episcopal Church, which, while preserving the Faith in its integrity and purity, has also exhibited care as to the form and intention of ordination to the ministry, reaching the stage of responsible official negotiation, it might be possible to make an approach to reunion on the basis of consecrations to the episcopate on lines suggested by such precedents as those of 1610. Further, in the opinion of the Conference, it might be possible to authorise arrangements (for the period of transition towards full union on the basis of episcopal ordination) which would respect the convictions of those who had not received episcopal Orders, without involving any surrender on our part of the principle of Church order laid down in the Preface to the Ordinal attached to the Book of Common Prayer.

76. Every opportunity should be welcomed of co-operation between members of different Communions in all matters pertaining to the social and moral welfare of the people.

77. The members of the Anglican Communion should take pains to study the doctrines and position of those who are separated from it and to promote a cordial mutual understanding; and, as a means towards this end, the Conference suggests that private meetings of ministers and laymen of different Christian bodies for common study, discussion, and prayer should be frequently held in convenient centres.

[1] See p. 420.

78. The constituted authorities of the various Churches of the Anglican Communion should, as opportunity offers, arrange conferences with representatives of other Christian Churches, and meetings for common acknowledgment of the sins of division, and for intercession for the growth of unity.

XVIII.

N.B.—*The following Reports must be taken as having the authority only of the Committees by whom they were respectively prepared and presented. The Committees were not in every case unanimous in adopting the Reports.*

The Conference, as a whole, is responsible only for the formal Resolutions agreed to after discussion, and printed above, pages 318 *to* 337.

**** An asterisk placed after the name of any Member of Committee denotes that he was unable to attend any of the Meetings of that Committee.*

No. 1.

Report of the Committee[1] *appointed to Consider and Report upon the Subject of Christian Faith in relation to Modern Thought, Scientific and Philosophical.*

The Committee desire to express their humble and thankful sense that the matter is one which, though encompassed with difficulty, is full of promise. It would be strange if the great inrush of new knowledge, and the unexampled changes in the

[1] Names of the Members of the Committee:—

Bishop of Antigua.
Archbishop of Armagh.*
Bishop Baynes.
Bishop of Bloemfontein.
,, Bombay (*Secretary*).
,, Calcutta.
,, Derry.
,, Exeter.
,, Meath.
,, Michigan.*
Bishop of Montreal.*
,, Niagara.
,, Ossory.
,, Ripon.
,, Southern Virginia.
,, Southern Ohio.*
,, Southwark(*Chairman*)
,, Tennessee.
,, Zanzibar.

relations of men with each other and with their surroundings, did not lay upon the Church duties of interpretation and recognition which even if she were less divided and marred by sin would task her to the utmost.

It is true that there is room for warning against overhaste in accepting, as certain, speculations which are often put forward under the name of science. These often go far beyond what sober scholars and men of science claim as ascertained knowledge, and it is by such speculations rather than by verified results that Faith is disturbed and Science brought into discredit. There is danger also lest men should attach a disproportionate value to knowledge which is new. It is by the old and familiar truths, after all, that men live, and the chief function of the Church is to witness to these, and of her ministers to teach them.

But we believe that God has given us to see more and to see better than we did, if we are diligent and willing to use the light given to us, and in that light to present to others what we ourselves believe. Of that light, as of all light, Christ is to us the centre and the ultimate source.

It will be convenient to speak first of the bearing of modern thought on spiritual or religious convictions generally, and then specifically of its bearing upon Christian faith.

I. It has seemed in recent times, to many of all classes, that materialism threatened to undermine all religion. It was probably inevitable that enormous advance in the ordered knowledge or science of outward things and in human power to command and use natural resources should lead to a temporary over-estimate of the material factor in life and in the content of knowledge. Speaking in a more popular way, we may say that great material comfort, grinding pressure of material poverty, and a tremendous stress of material progress and competition are alike unfavourable to the clearness, purity, and strength of spiritual conviction. These causes are in part permanent, and to see nothing beyond the material will probably be a permanent danger or temptation. But we desire to record our conviction that, as a phase of thought, materialism has largely lost its power. It has always been true that some of the most distinguished scientific teachers have been simple and devout believers. And even in such thoughts as Herbert Spencer's witness to an unknowable mystery of Being, and Huxley's assertion of the independence of the moral power in man, there are signs of what was incompatible with a mechanical and mindless universe. But other powers have come into play.

(1) The thinking power or mind in man has reasserted (through thinkers generally described as Idealist) the claim, which it has always been able to make, to an existence and value of its own not expressible in terms of matter, and in a true sense prior to that

of matter, since it is only in relation to consciousness that matter, as we know it, exists. Such thinkers, again, have made it clear that the conviction of the scientific man that he can understand Nature and the success of his attempts to do so imply that the material universe is the expression of a reason akin to that of the scientific man who investigates and understands it.

(2) To many it has come home, after the first rush and confusion of the new knowledge of natural things, that that silent, constant testimony of Nature to God, to which the Apostles appealed, is not less but greater since we have gained an incomparably enlarged vision of the splendour and scale and wealth of the universe of which we are a part.

(3) In its own way Art, as well as Poetry, has testified in forms of new delicacy and subtlety to the part played by mind and spirit in perceiving, rendering, and even making those things of beauty which we popularly speak of as outside aspects of matter independent of mind. Art knows and teaches that beauty depends on mind as much as on matter.

(4) From the side of Science itself the splendid thoroughness of analysis has, as it were, pierced through and behind matter, until that which seemed so solid and stable appears almost to vanish into some form of force of which we can hardly say that it is material at all, and which rather suggests what we only know in our own consciousness of life and will.

In these ways we feel that the dominance of materialism as an anti-spiritual power has been notably checked.

But while so saying, we take the opportunity to record our conviction that it is not the business of the Church, as such, to assume responsibility for any one system of thought or philosophy. We believe that Christian faith has something to learn from each, and something from which each may learn. And we are profoundly convinced that the fresh recognition of the wonder, the dignity, the influence of what we know as material is a true unveiling to us of what is from God. We believe also that it presents points of special congeniality to Christian faith, and we thus pass to the other portion of our main subject.

II. If we have rightly spoken of our age as one which has recognised anew the value of what is material, and which has also been forced back, by this very insistence of material things, upon its consciousness of something which is not material but spiritual, it would seem that this its double condition may be to a Christian as welcome as it is striking. For while Christian faith is essentially spiritual, holding to an unseen God, and speaking of things invisible, eternal, not of this world, yet it has on the other hand learnt from its Master, and has always asserted, the sacredness of everything that God has made. It has believed in God as One

from whom all things are and in whom they consist. It has believed that its knowledge of the Eternal Spirit, largely gained through parables of Nature and in forms of human experience, has come to the full in the visible life of One who wore a material body and lived in history at a certain date and was then seen and known and touched and loved by living men about Him. This is the twofoldness or paradox of Christian faith. It is not invented to meet the thought of to-day; it has always been there; but your Committee believe that under present circumstances the truth and naturalness of it receive fresh confirmation and that it gives out fresh power.

Christ, and nothing else, is the sum and substance, the object and centre, of our faith. The Gospel was and is the Gospel of Christ. It declared the acts and words, the life and character, the mighty works, the death and resurrection—in a word, the record—of Jesus, as they understood it upon whom the impression was made, with the meaning which afterwards wrought itself into shape in the creed. That He who was so declared can still claim to be the centre and object of the world's faith is in itself some sign that the claim is true.

We are well aware that in many minds there has been created an uneasy impression that the critical study of the Gospel narratives has reduced the history of our Lord's life upon earth to an uncertainty upon which we cannot build. But we wish to express our assurance that the fierce fire of modern criticism has only made it plainer that we have in the Gospels a definite and convincing picture of a unique personality. The record amply suffices to introduce to men and women the living Friend whom they learn to know better in the light of nearer and nearer personal communion.

The truth must shine by its own light; Christ is His own best witness.

But the witness needs to be read, and if we are to discharge our duty we must help men to read it. We must set forth Christ in His simplicity as Him who lived the life of perfect goodness, taught the perfect nature of life and duty in love to God and man, died the death of perfect obedience and perfect self-sacrifice, and won perfect victory, of which His resurrection from the dead on the third day was the seal. It is here that we find the truth of all that has been said in so many forms about coming "back to Christ." All the difficulties which our time has felt about proofs and signs have had their advantage in sending us to this deeper proof and evidence which comes out of Himself.

In saying this, it is only right to add (in view of the vague opinion reflected from time to time in current literature that it is possible to reach by critical processes an original non-miraculous

substratum of the Gospel history) our conviction that no historical criticism has been, or will be, able to eliminate miracles [1] from the story of the Gospels except by dealing in an arbitrary and unhistorical manner with the evidence.

We must set forth Christ in His simplicity; we must set Him forth also in His fulness. So it was done at first. He Himself said that He came to fulfil. He declared Himself, and was declared by the Apostles, as come to complete what went before in the life of a nation, and in the words and deeds of its representative men. And for the future a Spirit was to go out from Him—the Spirit of the Father—to gather men into the boundless vitality of one life.

Again, men have in them naturally something of two faiths, both wavering but both real, faith in man, as neither machine nor animal but a spiritual being, and faith in God, in Eternal Being with whom our own living and moral and loving spirits can have to do. These two faiths find themselves justified in Christ, who shows what Manhood can be, and what God is, in perfectness of Love. He shows in spite of evil that man is meant to be good and has a true value, and in spite of the sufferings and the dumbness of Nature that God is the love at which her whispers and her beauty hinted. Thus man's best instincts witness to Christ, and Christ confirms those instincts. Here is that which is as wide as the world and as enduring as time.

This truth of the fulness of Christ must guide our attitude towards other religions and other forms of life. None of these can be a real competitor with that of which the claim to be the one true faith is thus intrinsic and necessary. But Christians must never hesitate to look for what is true and good in them, to recognise that they have had a place in the purpose of the one loving God of all the earth, and to try to lead men by the truths

[1] In using the word *miracles* in a report dealing with scientific thought, we must guard ourselves against the often repeated misapprehension that the Church by that word means breaches or suspensions of the laws of Nature. To this end, instead of using any modern words, we prefer to quote the noble words of St. Augustine, so often quoted by theologians (*e.g.* Trench, on "The Miracles," p. 15, ed. 1866): Contra naturam non incongrue dicimus aliquid Deum facere, quod facit contra id quod novimus in naturâ. Hanc enim etiam appellamus naturam, cognitum nobis cursum solitumque naturæ, contra quem cum Deus aliquid facit, magnalia vel mirabilia nominantur. Contra illam vero summam naturæ legem a notitiâ remotam sive impiorum sive adhuc infirmorum, tam Deus nullo modo facit quam contra seipsum non facit. ("We say without impropriety that God does something 'against nature' which He does against *what we know* in nature. For it is this course of nature which is known to us and familiar that we call nature, and when God does anything contrary to this, such events are called marvels, or miracles. But as for that supreme law of nature which escapes our knowledge because we are sinful or because we are still weak, God no more acts against *that* than He acts against Himself)." Aug. *c. Faust.* xxvi. 3.

which they know to Him, the Truth in whom all truths meet. Preparation for Christ in Israel must surely have true though fainter analogues in other nations which move onward (as even the men of the Old Testament were taught to see) under the guidance of the One God. Manhood can never be full, or "the One Man in Christ Jesus" be complete, till the contributions of all the races are gathered in.

It is in the same way that we often recognise in lives and characters lacking Christian faith, examples or traits which give to Christians both rebuke and stimulus, and which are, in a true sense, Christian. The readiness in modern life and modern fiction to give such recognition is itself a Christian feature. It follows Christ's own example, and, as that example suggests, it need not imply any condonation of evil. That which welcomes truth or goodness with truest discernment should be equally sensitive to real falsehood and evil.

It is plain, again, that as with individuals, so with generations, the life that is from Christ must elicit what they have to give, and work this into itself. That life must therefore be progressive, though it does not change. Sure of itself, it must be ready to consider and welcome whatever criticism of its forms or expressions may arise from new knowledge or experience or surroundings. In order "that the things which cannot be shaken may remain," there is place and need for "shaking." Life from Christ went out, in outward historical experience, as a great stream or power to mould and create; and as it has moved onward, the range of its influence and meaning has grown larger and more full. So in a more special way within the Church of the believers the Life of which we partake in sacraments, of which creeds strive to express the nature and source, which declares itself in saintly lives, is a life which moves and grows towards the fulness which is the goal.

With such recognition of progress goes the recognition of proportion in the things of faith. We are sure of the life of Christ, in His history and person, and of the life derived from Him in the Church and in individual men. This certainty would not be shaken even if we should be unable to prove the authenticity of every part of the record, or even if we should find some inadequacy in the definitions by which the creeds attempt to explain the mystery of the unity of God and man in Him. But it is very easy to exaggerate or misuse this true and necessary matter of proportion. The highest truth and life must, like everything else among men, have language and expression, and alongside of the words which shift with men's varying apprehension of truth there must be other words which witness to its permanence. Such we believe to be the character and claim of the creed which we inherit,

by God's providence and blessing, from the days when the undivided Church expressed (not without reluctance to formulate what was so sacred) the faith which she knew to have been always hers in the Incarnate Word and the Triune God.

Your Committee believe that if Christians thus appear before men, in a confident but humble temper, teachers but therefore learners, sure of their faith but taught by their faith to watch for and welcome on every side, in forms of thought and lives of men, what comes from God and is made complete in Christ, His claims may be presented to men more worthily than ever before. That such fulness should have come through such simplicity, that all that the philosophies were seeking for should have been presented in fulness in a human life—this is still, as it was to St. Paul and to Justin, the sign that God's ways are not as our ways. But it tallies strikingly with the tendency in modern thought to recognise that personality is the highest thing that we know, containing most and explaining most.

Especially important is it to dwell upon the fact that in Christ the two great powers of morality and religion, often connected, always conscious of connection, but also too often at issue with each other, fuse absolutely and simply. The revelation of man's life as love responding to and serving an Eternal Being of life and love is the final word alike of morality and of religion. All else is the appropriation of this in interpretation and achievement.

In conclusion, your Committee desire to refer to three topics which bear closely on what they have written above, the problem of evil, the relation between the immanence and the transcendence of God, and the fact of religious experience.

I. There seems no reason to think that evil is less or more of an insoluble mystery to this generation than to any other. Those who most believe in Christ as the centre of light and life to the world will be the first to feel the darkness and intensity of the force which in manifold forms blinds men's eyes and weakens their wills for acceptance of Him. Such alleviation as the mystery has always received from the experience of the good which comes out of evil has been strengthened or illustrated on a large scale by all our understanding of the patient divine methods of evolution and growth. But we are here chiefly concerned to observe that the truth in Christ which has taught us hopeful sympathy with all human things has also (as St. John's writings show) revealed most convincingly the darkness of sin, which is alone adequate to explain the hauntings and instincts of conscience. The human inclusiveness and hopefulness of the Incarnation is not more truly part of what is in Christ revealed to faith than is the redemptive power

which reconciles to God in atonement a sinful and "prodigal" manhood.

We notice therefore with anxiety a tendency, not unnaturally produced by the concentration of attention on progress and development, to give to the doctrine of man's sinful state a less prominent place than is given to it in Holy Scripture. It was to save His people from their sins that the Son of God became man. It is only by insistence on His redeeming sacrifice and His power to save from sin that the Church can do her practical work of rescuing and ennobling mankind. Any teaching which is truly to represent the religion of Jesus Christ and of the Catholic Church must speak with no uncertain voice on the reality of sin and of redemption.

II. The question of the antithesis between transcendence and immanence is one of those upon which it is equally important to welcome the special messages of our own times and to guard that wholeness of truth which exclusive attention to those messages would impair. The immanence of God is part of the truth taught in Scripture, and abundantly acknowledged in Christian theology, though it is perhaps, from its seemingly neuter or abstract character, less easily apprehended by us and less welcome to many. Modern understanding of the vastness and ubiquity of order and modern analysis of the divine methods have greatly increased our sense of its significance and taught us to connect it with much that most commands our reverence. But it can never exclude or absorb that which is expressed by transcendence. The whole language of Scripture and religious experience about God, gradually clarified of crude anthropomorphisms till it expresses itself in the purely spiritual but still anthropomorphic truth that God is love, reveals something which is as much part of ultimate truth, and as needful to the proportion of faith, as that which is expressed by immanence. It is this which is meant by the truth of God's transcendence. The persistent witness of the conscience to the reality of sin, its persistent gaze beyond the imperfect reality towards a spiritual ideal, and our Lord's recognition of that ideal when He bids men to be perfect even as their Father which is in heaven is perfect, alike deliver us from pantheistic conceptions to which the doctrine of immanence leads when divorced from this complementary truth of transcendence. The former without the latter tends to break down the moral distinctions and to "heal slightly the wound" of sin. The latter without the former reduces life to an unreconciled dualism which asceticism tries in vain to solve.

In Christ we find the reconciliation of the two truths of immanence and transcendence. He proclaims, in the parables of the mustard seed and the leaven, the process by which His kingdom

grows, and leads us, while recognising the awful reality of evil, to sure faith in the ultimate victory of good. And St. Paul no less combines the two sides of truth when he speaks of the immanent Spirit which bears witness with our spirit that we are the sons of God, and yet resolutely faces the reality of evil which underlies the groaning and travailing in pain of creation waiting for the manifestation of the sons of God.

Here, again, the increased sense of the importance of personality gives assistance. It is the last category that we can conceive ourselves as discarding. Personality as applied by us to God must indeed always have clinging about it the imperfections due to its connection with our finite experience of finite persons. But it is an essential and permanent part of our thought about Him. Here religious experience decisively confirms what is implied in the truth of our Lord's incarnation. Being that knows and loves is at least as essential a part of our thoughts about God as is Being that is manifested, or is unfolded, or indwells.

Contemporary thought teaches us that we have still much to learn about the nature of our own personality, but we can hardly be wrong in saying that, upon that lower plane, we find in our own consciousness that which corresponds to, or suggests, what is meant by divine transcendence. And our experience of the life-history of personality in each human being, and of the way in which personalities are enlarged by, and communicate with, one another in what is called "personal influence," may give us some clue to the way in which God's transcendence and immanence may indeed be but two phases of one Being.

III. An important class of those who exemplify the recoil against materialism, already referred to, are certain writers who insist upon the existence of an ultimate spiritual power in the universe, and on the possibility of communion between this infinite spirit and ourselves. With the general trend of such teaching we are naturally in harmony; but when it is developed in detail we often find to our regret that Infinite Spirit means nothing more than the sum-total of cosmic forces. Such a conception, however interesting on other grounds, contains nothing that makes for moral or spiritual progress, cosmic force being equally and impartially responsible for good and evil, truth and falsehood, life and death. But such a system of spiritualistic pantheism, as it may be called, however defective in itself, at any rate suggests a truth which we desire to emphasise—namely, the reality of spiritual experience as a vital element in the Christian religion. Such experience is not to be treated as an obvious or easy thing. The God in whom we believe being holy and personal, the experience of communion with Him will require a rigorous process of purification and preparation, both moral and mental. But subject

to that condition, we believe that God does reveal Himself in hearts that truly seek Him; that religion, rooted in a distant past, becomes for them a living experience of the present; and that faith verifies itself in the lives of those who, "having the Son, have the witness in themselves."

EDW. SOUTHWARK,

Chairman.

No. 2.

Report of the Committee[1] *appointed to Consider and Report upon the Subject of*—(a) *The Supply and Training of Clergy;* (b) *Interchange of Service at Home and Abroad.*

In presenting our report upon the subject entrusted to us we wish to acknowledge the debt we owe to the small Committee appointed last year by the Archbishop of Canterbury to examine

[1] Names of the Members of the Committee :—

Bishop of Adelaide (*Secretary*).
" Antigua.
" Bath and Wells.
" Barbados.
Archbishop of Brisbane.
Bishop of Carlisle.
" Chota Nagpur.
" Colchester.
Bishop Courtney.
Bishop of Derby.
" Ely.
" Fredericton.*
" Gloucester.
" Grafton and Armidale.
" Grahamstown.
" Guiana.
Bishop Jaggar.*
Bishop of Jarrow.
" Liverpool.
" London (*Chairman*).
" Manchester.*
" Massachusetts.
Archbishop of Melbourne.*
Bishop of Milwaukee.
" Newfoundland.
Bishop Coadjutor of New Hampshire.*
Bishop of Nova Scotia.
" Ohio.
" Pretoria.
" Rangoon.*
" Richmond.
" Rochester.
Archbishop of Rupertsland.*
Bishop of St. Andrews.
" Saskatchewan.
" Sodor and Man.
Assistant Bishop of South Dakota.
Bishop Coadjutor of Southern Virginia.
Bishop of Tennessee.
" Thetford.
" Virginia.
" Wangaratta.*
" Woolwich.

into the question of the Supply and Training of Candidates for Holy Orders.[1]

Decrease in the Number of Candidates in the Provinces of Canterbury and York.

The facts and figures so carefully and accurately collected and embodied in the report presented by that Committee to the Archbishop have to a great extent lightened our labours. For instance, it has been unnecessary for us to investigate again the real facts with regard to the decrease of the numbers of those who in recent years have offered themselves for Holy Orders in England. They are given in a list which we add as an Appendix to this Report,[2] giving the numbers from the year 1877 to the year 1907. The numbers rose progressively in the Provinces of Canterbury and York from 697 until 1886, when they reached 814, and then declined until they fell to 587 in 1907.

These figures do not, however, really convey the seriousness of the decrease. As that report points out, "this decrease is the more serious when we remember that as a National Church we are bound to consider not only the needs of our own members, but the whole nation and its spiritual requirements.

"The increase in the population of England and Wales, after allowing for emigration, may be estimated at 260,000 a year at least. This growth of population calls for an increase (reckoning 2,600 souls to each minister) of 100 more clergy each year, or a total in twenty-two years of 2,200 clergy. Add this to the above stated deficit of 3,124, and the total shortage stands at the large figure of 5,324.

"The deficiency may be illustrated in another way. The number of deacons ordained for every 100,000 of the population of England and Wales was, in 1881, 2·7; in 1891, 2·5; in 1901, 1·7."

The Result Widely Felt in England.

"That this deficiency in the supply of clergy is proving a serious detriment to the Church is shown by the figures which have been supplied to us by the editor of 'The Statistical Returns of Parochial Work.' According to his estimate, the total number of assistant curacies in 1905–6 amounted to 6,925. Of these no fewer than 400, for which stipends were forthcoming, were vacant in that year. In 1906–7 the curacies were estimated at 6,832, and the vacancies under the aforesaid condition amounted to 424."

[1] "The Supply and Training of Candidates for Holy Orders." To be obtained from S.P.C.K., price 1*s.* 6*d.* post free.

[2] See p. 358.

And in other Provinces.

Members of our Committee who come from other Provinces also report a deficiency.

In the Church in the United States, while the number of communicants has more than doubled in the last twenty-five years, the number of candidates shows only a very slight increase.

Causes of the Decline.

It is easier to learn the facts of the decline in numbers than to be certain as to the causes which have led to it. No doubt some weight must be attached to what is called in the report we have alluded to, "theological unrest." Some men do undoubtedly go up to the University apparently with a vocation for Holy Orders and abandon their intention before they leave, but it must be remembered that such testing of vocation is in itself wholesome, and it is certainly a fact that some of those who do for the time give up their intention to be ordained return to it before the age of thirty.

Another cause undoubtedly is to be found in the manifold and interesting openings in all parts of the world for the youth of to-day. In the middle of the last century there were comparatively few careers for University men, but now the Civil Service at home and abroad, the attractive posts open to men with a knowledge of science, and spheres of work in literature or diplomacy are competing in the minds of the young men of the day with the ministry.

We feel, however, that this is not a matter for regret, as it tends to make the choice of the ministry, when it is made, much more real. We only want men in the sacred ministry who deliberately choose that life in preference to all others—not those who drift into it for want of something better—and we believe that, if rightly placed before young men, it will be found to be the most interesting of many other interesting ways of using their lives. It is only fair also to add that the ideal of the ministry is now considered so high that many of our best men hesitate to offer themselves for it from a sense of unworthiness; while, on the other hand, the examples of some of the clergy who fail to illustrate in their lives the finer traits of the ministry discourage many young men of strong and high character.

We have little doubt that so far as the Provinces of Canterbury and York are concerned, and to a large extent the Provinces in the rest of the British Empire, the main cause of the decline is financial.

Many of the clergy and professional men are no longer able

to send their sons to the University as they used once to do, and we find numbers of young men in City houses and banks who in more prosperous days would have been educated for the ministry at the expense of their fathers.

Parents, moreover, who naturally feel themselves responsible for the future of their sons, dissuade them from a profession which may leave them poor men all their lives, and this applies equally to the Colonial Dioceses.

The belief that the financial cause for the decline bulks largest of all is borne out by the numbers who are ready to take advantage of opportunities for preparation for Holy Orders when brought within their reach. Here, again, we are indebted to the report of the Archbishop's Committee for some valuable statistics. It appears that for the Ordination Candidates Fund on the average there were annually 300 inquirers and 120 formal applicants, of whom 46 were accepted; for the House of the Sacred Mission, Kelham, 300 inquirers, 80 to 90 eligible candidates, of whom there was only room to receive 12; for the College of the Resurrection, Mirfield, 300 to 400 inquirers, 100 eligible candidates, of whom there was room to receive 12; while a principal who has had experience at two theological colleges reports that during eighteen years he has had 2,770 inquirers, of whom he only knows of 920 who have been ordained. Allowing for a certain proportion who would have proved unsuitable, this represents a serious loss to the Church.

The pressing problem, therefore, before the Church in the immediate future is to discover men with vocations from God wherever they may be, sift those with true vocations from those who may be seeking ordination from any lower motive, thoroughly educate the men so selected, ordain them, and arrange how to distribute those thus selected, educated, and ordained as may be best for the good of the Church throughout the world.

Our report, therefore, falls into three heads: (I) Supply; (II) Training; (III) Interchange of Service.

I. Supply.

(1) In the first place we feel that we must in no way despair of a far larger supply from the sons of those who are well able to afford to pay for their education at the best public schools and universities. We must admit that on the whole the Church has hitherto failed to impress upon the imagination of the young men of the day the attractiveness of the ministry; parents, in their fear of saying too much, have often said too little; and even if they have refrained from giving the impression that they would be disappointed if their children were ordained, they have not

recognised that with themselves first lies the responsibility of bringing the idea of Holy Orders before the minds of their sons. Much, too, may be done by masters at private and public schools, or by teachers at universities, and we look more hopefully to such influence, privately exerted upon those who seem likely to respond to such appeals, than to many sermons on the subject addressed to general congregations of boys or undergraduates.

It is essential, too, that the ministry should be represented as a true man's work and as demanding the whole man, mind and will, as well as heart and spirit, and claiming him for a life of service and self-sacrifice in a glorious and inspiring cause. To this end the ministry must be represented not so much as one among other professions, but as a life-long service, and the Church not as an organisation which exists for purposes of its own, but as designed to be the most complete brotherhood in the history of the world.

Already there are signs that such a representation is having its effect upon the generous hearts of the young, and both in the public schools and universities many are turning their minds to Holy Orders. We also hear with great satisfaction that Colonial-born candidates are on the increase, and that in the Mission field more converts are being ordained.

(2) But turning now to those who for one reason or another, generally financial, have failed to proceed to the Universities from school life, our first recommendation is that there should be in every Diocese of the Anglican Communion, where such provision is not already made, an Ordination Candidates Council. This should consist of clergy and laymen, and should be as representative as possible of all schools of thought in the Church.

Before this Council all clergy throughout the Diocese who think they have fitting candidates needing financial assistance should appear and bring details concerning the life and character and antecedents of the man whom they desire to recommend. If *prima facie* the man seems suitable, he will himself be interviewed. It will be the duty of this Council to test to the best of their power the vocation of each of those brought before them. Sometimes it may be thought well to require a further period of probation in order to test the candidate's willingness to endure the hard work and even privation which his effort to fit himself for Orders often entails.

When, however, the Council feel certain that he is "called of God," they will give his name to the Bishop of the Diocese, and, if he confirms their view, the man will become a "diocesan candidate," for whom funds must be found, on the principle that, if God calls a man, He will provide the means to prepare him for the work to which He has called him. Such a candidate would

naturally be expected to be ready to serve in the Diocese which has helped him to be ordained.

(3) And that leads to our second recommendation, which is that in connection with this Ordination Candidates Council should be a fund, recognised in the Diocese as one of primary importance, for the purpose of training men for the work of the ministry.

The example of other Christian bodies should be followed, in which almost invariably the supply, training, and support of the ministry is the first charge upon the offerings of the faithful; in the Anglican Communion it has up to now been to a great extent the last. There is little doubt that, so far as the Provinces of Canterbury and York are concerned, the old endowments, instead of stimulating gifts from the living for the supply, training, and support of the ministry, have resulted in giving the impression that such gifts are unnecessary.

We would call special attention to an outline scheme of Church finance, given on page 30 of the Report recently made to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and which we reproduce as an Appendix.[1]

Whether such a scheme be adopted or not, our main point is that after the candidates have been selected, and a suitable education decided upon for each, it should be a matter of conscience with the faithful in the Diocese, not only to pray at all the Ember seasons and at other times for the diocesan candidates, but to provide funds for their adequate and thorough training.

Before leaving the subject of supply, we would call attention to the canon in the Church of the United States which allows ordinations to the diaconate at the age of twenty-one, as we think that in countries where school and university education ends at an early age such provision might be useful. It may be well to point out in this connection that Canon 34 of 1604 and the Preface to the Ordinal (since 1662) give the age for the Diaconate as twenty-three, the latter adding the provision "except he have a faculty." Although no faculty has apparently been granted for a very long period, the possibility of advantage being taken of this provision under certain circumstances ought to be recognised.

II. Training.

What the training for Holy Orders should be has been the subject of our long and careful consideration. The result of it may be stated as follows. We divide it into (A) Preliminary, (B) University, (C) Special:—

[1] See p. 360.

(A) *Preliminary Training.*

The experience of Bishops and their examining chaplains, as well as of tutors at the Universities and at Theological Colleges, brings to light the failure of home and school training in elementary Christian knowledge both in Scripture and doctrine. We therefore desire to lay the strongest stress on the duty and responsibility of parents themselves instructing their children in the Scriptures and in the fundamental principles of the Christian faith. We also urge parents to see that their children are given such instruction in their earlier years as may not only suggest and deepen, where it is the Divine Will, the sense of vocation to the Christian ministry, but may also form a sound basis for the subsequent and special training of those among their children who are called to this work.

We also desire to emphasise the duty of parochial clergy, especially at times of preparation for Confirmation, to ascertain who among the boys and young men in their parishes are in any way considering the question of taking Holy Orders, and to give them such spiritual help and guidance in their studies as will encourage them towards the realisation of their vocation.

(B) *University Training.*

The time has now come when, in view of the development of education and of the increased opportunities afforded for University training, all candidates for Holy Orders should be graduates of some recognised University, as the increased facilities for obtaining degrees from the newer Universities, with or without residence, bring a degree within the reach of those who are being mainly trained at Theological Colleges.

While we thankfully acknowledge that much is already being done at our older Universities for the spiritual life of candidates for Holy Orders, as well as of Churchmen generally, it is desirable that more definite provision be made by the Church, by means of hostels or otherwise, for aiding and watching over candidates during their University course.

We feel that premature specialisation in Theology during a University course is generally to be deprecated, inasmuch as we hold that a previous training in Arts is the best preparation for a study of Theology.

Before we pass to the consideration of the Special Training, we desire to say emphatically that purity, devotion, and force of character are of the first consideration in candidates for Holy Orders. The cultivation therefore of the moral and religious life in home, school, and University must be sustained and intensified

throughout the whole time of the education and training of candidates. It is consequently of vital importance that Bishops, examining chaplains, pastors, and all in authority in schools and universities should be careful to sift those who turn towards Holy Orders, so that only such as give hope of efficient service shall be received. All who have authority or responsibility should see to it that by faithfulness to duty, sobriety of life, and earnestness in prayer and worship candidates give good promise of a worthy ministry.

(C) *Special Training.*

In the case of graduates, all candidates should be required to receive *at least* one year of special training at a Theological College, or under some recognised supervision.

Where non-graduates are accepted, a course of *at least* three years of such special training should be required of all those who have already had a good general education, and at least four years of all others.

In the general scheme of studies adopted in Theological Colleges, much more attention should be given to the study of the text and contents of the Bible itself, as distinguished from that of commentaries upon it; a more careful training for the public reading of Holy Scripture and prayers, such training to include the art of voice production; the preparation for the composition and delivery of sermons and addresses and the study of missionary problems; the principles and methods of religious education, especially as applied to Sunday and day schools. We desire to emphasise the importance of teachers at Theological Colleges so guiding the intellectual life of their students as to encourage them to form convictions of their own on matters of faith and practice, and to think out for themselves the difficult problems involved in their ministry.

In addition to the usual curriculum of study generally followed in Theological Colleges, it is desirable that instruction should also be imparted in social and economic questions; general business principles; applied moral theology and Church law.

It is clear that, if these suggestions are to be carried out, a longer residence than is at present usual would be requisite at Theological Colleges, and that candidates should come there better prepared. Affiliation of every non-graduate Theological College to some University is desirable.

Since the diaconate is a period of training for the priesthood, as well as a time of practical work, its present normal length of one year is inadequate for this purpose, and we recommend that, where possible, a period of not less than two years in the diaconate should be required from candidates, in order that more time

might be given to definite intellectual and practical training under proper supervision.

We desire to call attention to the very grave responsibility incurred by a parish priest, who gives a title to a deacon, for properly training that deacon in the duties of his office, as well as for securing for him opportunity for study and preparation for the priesthood. We therefore suggest that Bishops should permit only specially qualified incumbents to grant titles.

The intellectual qualifications of a candidate for Holy Orders should be decisively tested before he is ordained deacon; during the diaconate he should devote his time to learning the theory and practice of parochial work, and to further training in reading and preaching; and should be encouraged and assisted to form such habits of regular study as he ought to maintain throughout his ministry. For this purpose we are of opinion that it is desirable, *wherever it is possible*, that regular instruction should be provided for deacons as well as for all younger clergy by means of lectures on *pastoralia* and on theological subjects, or, in cases where that is impossible, by correspondence. Deacons should also be encouraged, where it is practicable, to spend some time during their diaconate at a Theological College.

We wish it to be understood that the recommendations made in the previous sections represent what we hope will become the normal standard of the Church for the preparation of candidates for Holy Orders, but they are not to be taken as excluding from ordination those exceptional cases which may from time to time occur in any Diocese, and are specially likely to occur in pioneer Dioceses. In such cases the Bishop will naturally exercise his authority to modify the normal requirements. We would speak as emphatically as we can upon the necessity of candidates for the sacred ministry being men of spiritual character and power, and we recognise that there are many men who do not reach the educational standard outlined in this Report who, possessed of these spiritual qualifications, would do great things in certain portions of the Church for the furtherance of the Gospel, and be channels of great blessing.

We are also of opinion that in exceptional cases a Bishop should be free to exercise a dispensing power as to a candidate being "learned in the Latin tongue."

It should be noted that much that has been said is far more applicable to the Church in the British Empire than to the Church of the United States, which, by its canons, already lays down three years of preliminary probation under the eye of a Bishop, a University course, and a three years' subsequent training in theology. We have asked the Bishop of Massachusetts to write a note upon this subject, which will be found in the Appendix to this Report (p. 361).

III. Interchange of Service.

The third branch of the subject on which we were asked to report proved less difficult to us than the other two. Inquiries were made from members of our Committee who worked in different quarters of the world as to whether the experiment started some fifteen years ago of men going out for three or five years' work to the Colonial Church or to those departments of work in the Mission field or in India where no new language has to be acquired, was of use or not to the Church in those Dioceses to which they went, and also as to whether there was anything in the Colonial Clergy Act which unfairly impeded clergy from coming back from the Colonies to work in England, and we have arrived at the following conclusions:—

(1) The system of encouraging men to work abroad for a period of three or five years has proved successful and should be continued and carried out more thoroughly and systematically, with the help of the Council for Service Abroad or through other agencies.

(2) The names of such men should be kept upon the roll of the Diocese in which they have been last working, and they should be received, if they wish to return, with a real welcome, and in any question of future promotion they should stand upon their merits, in the same way as those who have never left the country of their ordination.

(3) In deference to a wish expressed on behalf of many Bishops it would be advisable to arrange a method by which clergy who are to work in the Church abroad could have the experience of a few years' training in parochial work in England, and to this end the facilities at present restricted to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the Bishop of London for ordaining men under the Colonial Clergy Act should be extended to some other Bishops in England.

(4) After careful consideration of the Colonial Clergy Act, some such precaution as that Act involves appears to us necessary, and if the Act continues to be administered in the spirit of the Archbishops' letter of November, 1904, which is printed in full in the Appendix,[1] the grievances which have been felt about it would be reduced to a minimum.

(5) In view of the embarrassment arising from the lack of uniform usage regulating the transfer of clergymen from one Diocese to another, and from one country to another, it is necessary that none should be received into a Diocese or missionary jurisdiction of the Anglican Communion without having, in addition to the ordinary Letters Testimonial, a letter of transfer

[1] See p. 363.

or confidential communication from the Bishop of the Diocese from which he comes.

At the same time it was felt that, when a clergyman from any Diocese in the Anglican Communion visiting another Diocese brings a letter from his Bishop stating that he is in good standing and trustworthy he should be welcomed as a brother, and made to feel that he is not on a lower footing than the clergy already ministering in that Diocese.

We firmly believe that a wider interchange of service would benefit all concerned. Just as we find those who have gone abroad for three or five years come back to the Church in England more experienced and stronger men, so we think that clergy abroad might benefit by three or five years' experience in an English parish. After working in a parish with a large staff they would return with a more detailed knowledge of the possibilities of parish work than it is possible to acquire when working by themselves over large tracts of country.

We would gladly welcome the extension of a system already adopted in the Dioceses of Brisbane, Rockhampton, and Bathurst, and also in some parts of the Mission field, where some four or five clergy live together and work a large district, and after periods of absence return to their centre for spiritual communion with one another and a time of reading and study.

This extension would tend to lessen the anxiety lest in complete isolation a young man may lose heart or even deteriorate in character and standard of life.

We cannot conclude our Report without alluding to two matters which, though not coming directly under the reference made to our Committee, have a distinct bearing upon the whole subject.

The first refers to the superannuation of the clergy and their support in old age. The time has come to have an efficient pension scheme for the clergy, and no such scheme can be formed without resorting to some measure of compulsion, as is the case in other professions. If each young man on being ordained was compelled to make a contribution towards a pension fund, it would not be necessary for men to retain their posts long after they are unfit for their work, thereby lowering the standard of clerical efficiency.

The second relates to the numerous small parishes in England which do not give a man full scope for his powers, and which reduce him to a state of contented or discontented dejection. In view of the crying need for men in all parts of the world, this cannot be a right state of things, and we suggest the desirability of reconsidering the whole question of supplying the spiritual needs of country districts.

But, whether or not these last two suggestions are considered immediately practicable, we trust that the recommendations which

we have made with regard to the supply and training of the ministry, and interchange of service, will be for the greater efficiency of the work of the Church, and we beg to propose to the Conference the Resolutions in accordance with these recommendations.

(Signed) A. F. LONDON:

Chairman.

APPENDICES.

APPENDIX I.

THE DEFICIT IN THE SUPPLY OF CANDIDATES FOR HOLY ORDERS.

I.—*Number of Deacons ordained*, 1877–1907.

1877	...	697	1887	...	771	1897	...	652
1878	...	661	1888	...	739	1898	...	638
1879	...	677	1889	...	777	1899	...	661
1880	...	679	1890	...	746	1900	...	650
1881	...	713	1891	...	745	1901	...	569
1882	...	729	1892	...	737	1902	...	576
1883	...	781	1893	...	747	1903	...	594
1884	...	759	1894	...	684	1904	...	569
1885	...	783	1895	...	720	1905	...	624
1886	...	814	1896	...	704	1906	...	580
						1907	...	587

II.—It will be seen from the figures here given that the numbers rose to their highest point in 1886, since which year the fall has been continuous, the quinquennial average being as follows:—

5 years (1877–1881)	...	...	687 per annum.
5 years (1882–1886)	...	...	773 per annum.
5 years (1887–1891)	...	...	756 per annum.
5 years (1892–1896)	...	...	720 per annum.
5 years (1897–1901)	...	...	634 per annum.
5 years (1902–1906)	...	...	589 per annum.
In the year 1907	...	...	587

III.—*Numbers Ordained as compared with the Standard of 1886.*

Had the standard of 1886 been maintained the number of Deacons ordained, 1886–1907, would be	17,808
The actual number ordained, 1886–1907 ...	14,784
Deficit in 22 years	3,024

IV.—*Deficit when Increase of Population is taken into Account.*

The yearly increase of population (after allowing for emigration) is 260,000, requiring a yearly increase (reckoning 2,600 for one Priest) of 100 Clergy.

Deficit in 22 years, 1886–1907	2,000
Add deficit as shown in Section III.	3,024
Total	5,024

V.—*Further Facts and Figures bearing on the same Question.*

The Editor of "The Statistical Returns of Parochial Work" (*see Official Year Book*, 1908, *pp. xxvii–xl*) has been able, in the execution of his work, to collect facts regarding vacant curacies and understaffed parishes, indicating the present shortage in the supply of Clergy in England. The conclusion which he arrives at is that the Church requires at once another 1,000 Priests outside the present supply. The following figures are suggestive:—

	1905–6.	1906–7.
Number of Assistant Curates	6,925	6,832
Number of vacant Curacies for which money is forthcoming	400	424

VI.—The Additional Curates Society, which makes grants to nearly 1,400 curates, possesses a wide knowledge of the condition of the Assistant Curate "Market," and the extent of vacant curacies is accurately known through the amount of grants left undrawn.

In	1903	such	vacancies	were	16 per cent.
,,	1904	,,	,,	,,	17 ,,
,,	1905	,,	,,	,,	18 ,,
,,	1906	,,	,,	,,	19 ,,
,,	1907	,,	,,	,,	19 ,,

VII.—*Deficit when the Needs of Over-sea Dioceses are taken into Account.*

The United Boards of Missions have recently (1908) communicated with the Anglican Dioceses abroad inquiring as to the minimum number of Priests immediately required for the efficient staffing of these Dioceses. It should be understood that the total number of Clergy desired is far in excess of the minimum. So far (May, 1908), answers have been received from 52 Dioceses, showing the following figures :—

Number of Priests needed for 52 Over-sea Dioceses	288
Number required for the 104 Over-sea Dioceses at same rate	576

VIII.—Each year the Church Missionary Society has to consider applications for reinforcements. The figures for 1907 are as follows :—

Applications for Clergy specially needed to fill definite vacancies	76
Actual number sent in response to these applications	19

IX.—In November, 1907, S.P.G. prepared a careful list of the number of Clergy needed in the Dioceses and Missions under the special care of the Society. This list shows the following results :—

Number of Priests needed by S.P.G.	164

APPENDIX II.

An Outline Scheme of Finance.

We therefore indicate in broad outline the shape which it appears to us that such a scheme might take :—

(i) There should be a Central Finance Board for the two Provinces.

(*a*) The Queen Victoria Clergy Fund and (*b*) the Clergy Pensions Institution might well be regarded as Executive Committees of such a Board (with all their excellent machinery left undisturbed) to deal with maintenance and superannuation respectively.

(*c*) The Central Candidates Council would form a third Executive Committee to deal with the finances of recruiting and training for the Ministry.

(ii) Each Diocese should have its own Finance Board, and similarly associate with itself, as Executive Committees for Maintenance and Superannuation, the already existing Diocesan Committees of the Queen Victoria Clergy Fund and the Clergy Pensions Institution, and in addition its Candidates Committee existing or to be created.[1]

(iii) It would rest with the Central Finance Board to determine what amount would be needed for the three objects under their control, and to ascertain how much could be raised in each Diocese for this purpose.

(iv) In raising the required amount it would be necessary for the Diocesan Finance Boards to invite each parish to take a share by contributing its quota.

(v) While each parish would be left to raise its annual contribution in such a manner as it might deem best, the system should be gradually established of claiming from each Churchman and Churchwoman of the parish his or her annual CHURCH DUE as a bounden duty of membership.[2]

APPENDIX III.

NOTE BY THE BISHOP OF MASSACHUSETTS ON REQUIREMENTS FOR HOLY ORDERS IN THE UNITED STATES.

The Church in the United States has had for many years in her canons and practice the following standards:—

(1) As regards tests of character of candidates.

The Bishop receives a young man as a Postulant upon the testimony of a clergyman as to his qualifications, physical, intellectual, moral, and spiritual, for the Ministry. Before the Bishop can admit him as a candidate the Postulant must be commended to him by the Standing Committee of the Diocese, whose action is based upon the statement of one clergyman and four laymen that the Postulant is sober, honest, and godly, and possesses such qualifications as fit him for the Ministry. The Standing Committee

[1] Every Diocese of the two Provinces has already a Diocesan Committee of the Clergy Pensions Institution, and every Diocese save two has an affiliated branch of the Queen Victoria Clergy Fund, while of the thirty-seven dioceses twenty possess Candidates Committees. Hence the machinery for effective diocesan action is all but complete already.

[2] If the quota of each parish of our thirty-seven dioceses were calculated on the basis of a shilling per head of the Church population, and the Church population calculated at double the number of Communicants—a very low estimate—the income thus raised would produce just £225,000 a year. The yearly income of the C.P.I. and of the Q.V.C.F., both diocesan and central, is at present about £65,000.

is a Board of clergy and laymen elected by the Annual Diocesan Convention as the Executive Committee of the Diocese and the Council of Advice to the Bishop.

The term of candidateship is three years, during which the candidate reports by letter or personally to the Bishop quarterly and prepares for Holy Orders.

Before ordination he must be recommended to the Bishop for ordination by the Standing Committee as having lived during the past three years a sober, honest, and godly life, and as loyal to the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the Church, such recommendation being based upon the endorsement of one presbyter and six laymen.

At the time of his ordination, therefore, the candidate commended by clergy and laity has been for three years under the direction, guidance, and leadership of his Bishop.

For exceptional reasons the canonical term may be shortened to a certain extent by the Bishop with the advice and consent of the Standing Committee; but no exception can be made in testimonials of character.

(2) As regards intellectual tests.

Before being received as a candidate the Postulant must satisfy the Bishop that he is a graduate in arts of some university or college in which he has studied the Latin and Greek languages. If he is not a graduate he must pass examinations in subjects studied in the university.

During the three years of his candidateship he is studying in a theological school.

Before ordination to the priesthood he must pass three separate examinations in the Old and New Testaments in Hebrew and Greek, theology, ecclesiastical history, Christian ethics, ecclesiastical polity, the Book of Common Prayer, the constitution and canons of the Church, and the principles and methods of religious education. He must also present sermons, give proof of his ability to conduct the services of the Church in an edifying manner, and competently fulfil the public duties of the sacred ministry.

While it is the general rule and desirable that all the examinations be taken before ordination to the diaconate, the Bishop may ordain to the diaconate a candidate who has passed the first examination which includes Hebrew, Greek, the Scriptures, the two Creeds, some ecclesiastical History and Polity, and the office and ministration of a deacon.

Dispensation from the study of Hebrew may be given by the Bishop, but dispensation from Latin and Greek can be given by the Bishop only with the consent of three-fourths of the Standing Committee. No dispensation from other subjects can be given.

It will thus be seen that the standards of the Church in the

United States, admitting exceptions under certain conditions, are that her ministers shall be graduates of universities and have also had three years of special study and spiritual preparation.

In many respects, therefore, the report and resolutions of the Committee do not have a direct relation to the conditions of the Church in the United States.

APPENDIX IV.

The Archbishops' Circular Letter on the Working of the Colonial Clergy Act.

Lambeth Palace, London, S.E.

Circumstances have led during the last few years to a reconsideration on the part of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York of the conditions and rules affecting the ministry, in these two Provinces of the Anglican Church, of clergy who have been ordained elsewhere. The Archbishop of Canterbury has not infrequently received communications on the subject from Bishops of Colonial Dioceses who are dissatisfied with the arrangements which have been in force, and a weighty memorial upon the subject was recently transmitted from the Joint Committee of the General Synod of Canada.

The subject is one of increasing difficulty. On the one hand, we in England are even more anxious than formerly to secure for the Church at home the advantage of the help which comes from the ministry, occasional or permanent, of men whose experience in other parts of the world enables them to contribute to our common work an element of the highest possible value. On the other hand, we are restricted by existing law to certain lines of action in this particular matter, and it would probably be difficult at present to obtain any change of the Statutes affecting the question. They were originally fashioned in circumstances very different from those of to-day, and their rigidity calls undoubtedly for some practical relaxation when they are applied in daily use. Appended to this letter is a statement showing exactly what the legally prescribed conditions are. It would, however, be quite erroneous to suppose that the almost austere tenor of statute law, and especially of statute law which is now in some respects out of date, represents appropriately the attitude which the Archbishops and Bishops in the two Provinces of England proper desire to adopt in regard to the interchange of mutal service between the clergy of the Anglican Church in different parts of the world.

An examination of the legal memorandum hereto appended will show that it is possible, while strictly obeying in England the existing law, to dispense, in some degree, with detailed and almost harassing stipulations which are apt to puzzle some of those who, coming across the sea, desire to minister in English parishes. The difficulty against which we have to be on our guard is this: The closer bonds which unite Colonial life with the home life in England, and the facility and the frequency of communication and travel, render it both more easy and more common for clergy ordained elsewhere to find openings for work in England, and the existing disproportion in England between the number of candidates for ministerial work and the number of openings for such work increases the facility with which any man in Holy Orders who presents the usual testimonials can obtain employment in England. Undoubtedly there are many men admirably qualified for the kind of work required, say, in outlying parts of our less populous Colonies, or perhaps of the United States, who yet lack the qualifications, intellectual and theological, which have been rightly regarded as essential preliminaries to Ordination in England, where a man once ordained, and maintaining a good character, stands legally as well as ecclesiastically in a position quite different from the corresponding position in a non-established Church. Nothing but good would ensue from the occasional ministry of such men in our home parishes, provided they be properly accredited by the Diocesan from whom they come. But it is another matter to place them, without further investigation, and at an early date after their Ordination, upon the list of fully qualified clergy of the Established Church in England. Examples are not rare of men who, having failed to obtain Ordination in England, or perhaps having abstained from applying for it, have been, quite rightly, ordained under the different conditions prevailing in some Colonial Diocese, and have returned within a year or two to England, frequently on the ground of the health or inclination of a wife, and have then regarded themselves, or been regarded by their friends, as aggrieved if difficulties were raised about their permanent ministry in England.

In these circumstances our view is that the difficulty will best be met by our marking somewhat more emphatically than hitherto the difference between temporary permission, given with a clear understanding that its holder is going to return before long to the Diocese of his Ordination, or to some other similar Diocese, and permission given to men who have returned to England with the intention, more or less clearly defined, of exercising their subsequent ministry there. Even in this latter case the Archbishop's Licence must in the first instance be given temporarily and not permanently if the provisions of the existing law are to be obeyed;

but such temporary permission can without difficulty be transformed into a permanent Licence in the case of those whose qualifications would have entitled them at the outset to Ordination in England, or whose work outside England has been so long and so excellent as to entitle them on the strength of long experience to every privilege that we can give. We trust, therefore, that those who—to our great advantage and also, we hope, to their own—desire the temporary permission will not deem it to be discourteous on our part if the forms and regulations which we have to use or impose should sometimes seem to be not quite applicable to men whose visits we cordially welcome and whose fellowship and ministry we prize. They will bear in mind the difficulties against which we have in some instances to be on our guard, and the formalities which the Established Church, from its very nature, requires. Difficult cases will still arise. For example, it is not uncommon for those who obtain temporary permission with the express intention of returning speedily to Colonial work to change their minds and desire to remain permanently in England. Such cases must, of course, be considered upon their merits as they arise.

Everything which tends to consolidate the union of the Anglican Church throughout the world, and to emphasise the mutual advantage which arises from an interchange of work on the part of those who in different parts of the world are labouring in the service of our common Lord, is to be commended and encouraged. To His guidance and protection we look in devising our plans and in making them effective for the general good.

RANDALL CANTUAR :

WILLELM : EBOR :

November, 1904.

Memorandum.

1784. By 24 George III., chapter 35, persons being subjects or citizens of countries out of His Majesty's Dominions are authorised to be ordained for service in such countries without being required to take the Oath of Allegiance to the King.

1819. By 59 George III., chapter 60, persons specially destined for the cure of souls in His Majesty's Colonies or Foreign Possessions are authorised to be ordained subject to their making a declaration of the purpose for which they are ordained.

1864. By 27 & 28 Victoria, chapter 94, clergymen ordained by Bishops of the Episcopal Church in Scotland are subject to the following restrictions, namely: (A) a clergyman so ordained cannot be admitted to a benefice or preferment without the consent

of the Bishop, which may be refused without reason assigned; (B) he cannot be admitted to a benefice or licensed to a curacy in England without making the declaration and subscription required of ordinands in England; (C) unless beneficed he may not without rendering himself liable to a penalty officiate in England for more than one day within three months without notifying the Bishop.

1874. By 37 & 38 Victoria, chapter 77, the present law as to Colonially ordained clergymen was enacted.

I. Colonially ordained clergymen are: —

(A) Clergymen ordained by any Bishop other than a Bishop of a Diocese in England or Ireland (Colonial Clergy Act, 37 & 38 Victoria, chapter 77, section 3), and other than a Bishop in communion with the Church of England acting on the request and commission of a Bishop of a Diocese in England, in relation to that Diocese (15 & 16 Victoria, chapter 52, sections 1 & 2; 16 & 17 Victoria, chapter 49; 37 & 38 Victoria, chapter 77, section 8).

(B) Clergymen ordained under 24 George III., chapter 35, and clergymen ordained under 59 George III., chapter 60 (37 & 38 Victoria, chapter 77, section 9).

A clergyman who receives Deacon's Orders as above, but receives Priest's Orders from a Bishop of a Diocese in England or Ireland, is by long custom not regarded as a Colonially ordained clergyman. In the converse case of Deacon's Orders being conferred by an English or an Irish Bishop, but Priest's Orders being conferred as above, the clergyman is regarded as Colonially ordained.

II. (A) Under the provisions of the Colonial Clergy Act (section 3) a Colonially ordained clergyman cannot officiate in any Church or Chapel in England without (1) the written permission of the Archbishop of the Province in which he proposes to officiate, and without also (2) making and subscribing a declaration in the prescribed form of assent to the Thirty-nine Articles and of Submission while ministering in England to use the Prayer Book only. This permission is usually given temporarily and is subject to revocation by the Archbishop at his discretion.

(B) A Colonially ordained clergyman, even though he holds the Archbishop's permission to officiate, cannot be admitted to a benefice or other preferment in England without the previous consent in writing of the Bishop.

(C) A Colonially ordained clergyman who has held preferment or has acted as curate in England for a period or periods exceeding in the aggregate two years, may with the consent of the Bishop of the Diocese in which he then holds prefer-

ment or acts as a curate apply to the Archbishop for a licence, which, if granted, places him for all purposes in the position of a clergyman ordained in England.

No. 3.

Report of the Committee[1] *appointed to Consider and Report upon the Subject of Religious Education in Schools.*

It is not, in the opinion of the Committee, desirable that the Lambeth Conference should attempt to frame any general Resolutions, intended to apply to all countries, either as to the exact form of religious instruction which should be given in particular schools and classes of schools, or as to the right relations between Church and State in the matter of giving such instruction. The conditions of the different countries in which the Anglican Communion is at work are too diverse to admit of any hope that such a task could be profitably undertaken. We should hinder rather than help one another by any such attempt.

But there are one or two broad propositions confirmed by history, by modern experience, and by educational theory, on which it would be useful to insist. We can state our ideal and indicate means by which, in course of time, by the steady witness and persistent endeavour of the Church and with the good hand of our God upon us, that ideal might be more and more perfectly translated into practice.

We would begin by insisting that, in all educational effort, the imparting of information is a means to a still higher end—namely,

[1] Names of the Members of the Committee:—

Bishop of Auckland.
" Barking.
" Barrow-in-Furness.
" Beverley.
" North Carolina.
" Cashel.
" Croydon (*Secretary*).
" Saskatchewan.
" Derby.
" Islington.
" Jarrow.
" Kearney.*
" Keewatin.
" Killaloe.*
Bishop of Lichfield.
" Manchester (*Chairman*).
" Western Michigan.
" Ontario.
" Central Pennsylvania.
" Perth.
" Peterborough.
" Pretoria.
" North Queensland.
Bishop Taylor Smith.
Bishop of St. Davids.
" St. Asaph.
" St. German's.

the development of character. The real object at which the teacher should aim is to bring out, in those committed to his care, an effective desire to know the Truth, to do the Truth, and to be of the Truth, and to cultivate harmoniously and co-ordinately all the powers of the child, bodily, mental, and spiritual. There cannot be a greater wrong than to inflict upon a child, in the name of education, a training which deliberately leaves some of his best faculties uncultivated, so far as his school life is concerned.

It has indeed been represented that where purely secular systems of education have obtained, the results have not always been disastrous. It may well be the case that the existence of purely secular schools in a country increases the vigilance of all religious bodies and of parents, and that the work of religious training, being done by those who are most profoundly interested in the child, is well done. But such palliatives are not always available. The testimony as to the evil effects of education which is wholly secular in new and sparsely populated countries is very clear and unmistakable. Nor is the condition of congested populations in large cities more favourable, so far as religious influences outside the school are concerned, than that of new countries. A child trained on purely secular lines must always be on one side of his character untrained, and even where other religious influences are strong, it cannot be doubted that they would be stronger if the influence of the teacher was with them. It seems to be the undoubted duty of the Church to bear a clear testimony against the danger of purely secular systems of education, a danger to which the framers of such systems show themselves not insensible by the inclusion of Nature-study and moral training in the place usually given to religious instruction.

There are many ways in which we may work, and ought to work, towards the ideal of true education.

In the first place, we ought to keep clearly before ourselves and before the minds of all teachers what is meant by religious education.

There are certain broad outlines of Bible history which admit of historical and ethical treatment without involving many doctrinal issues, except as between those who do or do not hold the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity. It is, no doubt, of the greatest value that a child should learn these outlines. At the lowest estimate they may be considered indispensable to a liberal education in a Christian country. But without at all disparaging the worth of such teaching at its best, the Church weakens rather than strengthens its plea for religious education if it allows such instruction to be reckoned as adequate religious education. Bible teaching misses even its true educational value when it does not definitely aim at producing faith in God through our Lord Jesus

Christ, and living fellowship with the Church of Christ through the sanctifying grace of the Holy Ghost, together with habits of private devotion and of regular Bible study. It is perilous for us to accept any lower ideal of religious education, even though the prospect of finding room for it in the school system of a country may seem to be very far distant. This still remains our standard of religious education.

In the second place, we should be alert to use every facility which the State grants to religious bodies in respect of religious teaching in schools, and to secure for their children in every possible way teaching in the faith of their parents.

In the third place, the Church can do something towards realising its ideal by holding fast to it in the schools which are under its influence. Setting aside for the moment the consideration of the State school system and Church schools embraced in that system, the Church has still open to it a large sphere of educational effort, both in the Mission field and in the secondary schools of many Christian countries, of which it has not yet made adequate use. Church schools for children of educated Church parents are sorely needed in almost every country where such parents are to be found. From all parts of the Mission field and from the Colonies the cry comes to our Church to devote our most cultured sons and daughters to this noble work. Hitherto it has fallen for the most part on unheeding ears, with the result that we are outstripped by other religious bodies in many parts of the world, who are teaching our children with the not infrequent result that those children are lost to our Communion. It seems desirable that the voice of the Lambeth Conference should speak out strongly against this fatal indifference, and that the Church should pray to God for the gift of teachers who will devote their lives to the service of teaching wherever He is pleased to open the way for such service.

Fourthly, we have great need to strengthen our Sunday-school system. The Anglican Communion has been behindhand in the work as compared with other religious bodies. There seems to be no reason why our disconnected Sunday-schools should not be consolidated into a fellowship or brotherhood all over the world. The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America has appointed a commission to inquire into the whole system of Sunday-school teaching. No doubt there are portions of the inquiry which concern that Church alone. But there must be many others of interest to the whole Church—the syllabus, the apparatus, the employment of trained and paid teachers, the grading of Sunday-schools, the relation of Sunday-schools to Church government, and the like. In the Sunday-school the Church is at liberty to maintain the very highest ideal of religious

education. It seems desirable that a committee or commission of this Conference should be appointed to report to His Grace the President on the best methods of improving Sunday-school instruction.

To the same Committee might be entrusted the consideration of the duty of catechising and of the right relations between the Sunday-school and the system known as "the Catechism" in church. For the two should not be regarded as rivals but as allies, whose common work, in countries where education is mainly secular, is of inestimable importance.

Fifthly, as bearing on this question, the Committee cannot pass by the important question of maintaining amongst trained teachers all possible helps towards the highest idea of their vocation. It would seem to be a right step in this direction that we should regard "the gift of teaching" as one of the great gifts of Christ to His Church, and should formally recognise the status of those who possess the gift by strengthening the order of Catechists. Catechists play a very important part in the Mission field. They are not less needed in settled Churches. At present the Church has done too little in the way of recognising the gifts of these men and of organising their services. They should be encouraged to believe that the Church has a use for their work and sets a high value upon it by something more distinct than such diocesan privileges as are in many cases awarded them. In this connexion we would mention for recognition by the Church, and for extension, the Guilds and Associations of Day School Teachers, which have been found invaluable, where they have been formed, in promoting spiritual fellowship among teachers.

Sixthly, we should strain every nerve to secure religious training for those who intend to enter the teaching profession, or at least to put religious influence within their reach where definite religious training cannot be secured. Even secular education is reported to be least harmful in countries in which teachers are expected by public opinion to be religious men and women. Where teachers are appointed to give religious instruction, they ought themselves to have religious education.

The need for such education is all the greater because the Bible cannot now be taught, even to children, exactly as it was taught thirty years ago. A generation of research and criticism, unparalleled by any previous generation in Church history, has left the Bible more firmly established than ever in its position of the great written revelation of God to man. But to teach it as though this research had never been conducted, or as though it had brought no truth to light, is to leave children unprepared for the active secularist propaganda which they must face when they are grown up. The preparation of a teacher for religious instruc-

tion is a far more serious matter to-day than it was when most of the existing schemes of Bible instruction were prepared. This fact is far better understood in the United States than in England, and there is much to be learnt from the Bible schools which are being established there. It is important that teachers should believe faithfully and vitally what they teach, nor is it less important that what they believe and what they teach should be true in itself.

But this necessity is not understood by all authorities that have the training of teachers. There are not many, however, which are not willing that free access should be given to religious bodies to exert such voluntary influence as they can. All possible use should be made by the Church of such opportunities, and especially in secondary schools, normal schools, and Universities. Clergy, carefully selected for the work, should be appointed, as far as possible at all these centres, to form classes for religious instruction and to encourage religious unions among the students themselves. There is at the present time a great spiritual movement—the University Student Volunteer movement—which is doing a work in the Universities for which we cannot be too thankful. Its influence is felt in Universities all over the world. It should be watched with prayerful interest by our Church, which has many lessons to learn from it.

Last, but most important of all, is the testimony of the Church to parents in all conditions of social life as to their responsibility and privilege in respect of the religious instruction of their children. It ought to be repeated with increasing emphasis that no Day-schools, no Sunday-schools, no Catechisms can rob them of this great opportunity or excuse them for neglect of it. Nothing is more clearly emphasised in the Word of God than the duty of parents to teach their own children. None have endeavoured to discharge this duty wisely without earning love and gratitude from their children, long after the days of childhood are over. None have discharged it without untold spiritual benefit to themselves. As soon as the Church succeeds in teaching parents their duty to their children, it may await without great anxiety passing waves of public opinion in favour of secularism. Parents who have tried to teach their children will not easily be denied their rights in the schools of their country. They will demand religious education for their children, and that consistent religious education. They will claim some voice in the appointment of teachers to whom they entrust their children. If their demand is backed up by teachers who wish to give religious education in the highest sense of the word, the union of these two forces must in time be irresistible. It will sweep away many of the prejudices which at present are depriving many children of the English-speaking race

over all the world of their rightful heritage. The witness of the Church will be efficacious, as soon as the Church is in real earnest about it, and no sooner.

(Signed) E. A. MANCHESTER,
Chairman.

No. 4.

Report of the Committee[1] *appointed to Consider and Report upon the Subject of Foreign Missions*—(a) *The Growth of the Church on Racial and National Lines*—(1) *Asia*, (2) *Africa*, (3) *America*; (b) *Correlation and Co-operation of Missionary Agencies.*

PREFACE.

Your Committee acknowledge with deep thankfulness to Almighty God the continued blessing which He has vouchsafed

[1] Names of the Members of the Committee :—

Bishop of Alaska.
,, Algoma.
,, Calcutta.
,, Carpentaria.
,, Chota Nagpur.
,, Clogher.
,, Colombo.
,, Falkland Islands.
,, Fuh-kien.
,, Glasgow.
,, Guiana.
Bishop Hamlyn.
Bishop of Hankow.
,, Hokkaido.
,, Indianapolis.
,, Korea.
,, Lahore.
,, Limerick.*
Bishop of Liverpool.
,, Madras (*Secretary*).
,, Mauritius.
,, Melanesia.
,, Mid China.
,, Minnesota.*
,, Moosonee.
,, Natal.
,, North Carolina.
,, North China.
Bishop of Pretoria.
,, Rhode Island.
,, St. Albans (*Chairman*).
,, St. John's, Kaffraria.
,, Salina.*
,, Shanghai.
,, Sierra Leone.
,, Southern Brazil.
,, Stirling.
,, Taylor Smith.
Bishop of Tinnevelly.
,, Tokyo.
,, Uganda.
,, Victoria.
Bishop Coadjutor of Southern Virginia.
Bishop of Waiapu.
Archbishop of West Indies.
Bishop of Western Equatorial Africa.
Assistant Bishop of Western Equatorial Africa (Johnson).
Assistant Bishop of Western Equatorial Africa (Oluwole).
Bishop of Western New York.
,, Yukon.
,, Zanzibar.
,, Zululand.

upon the missionary work of the Church during the last ten years, and earnestly appeal to all members of the Anglican Communion for unceasing prayer and unremitting efforts that the Church may yet more fully realise her vocation to proclaim to all mankind the Gospel of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

The problems of the Mission field to-day are not essentially different from those which were before the Church at the last Lambeth Conference. The importance of encouraging the independence and autonomy of Native Churches, the establishment of native episcopates, the adaptation of the services, discipline, and organisation of the Church to local needs, and the necessity of making far more earnest efforts to evangelise the Mohammedan world, especially in India and Africa, are still among the most serious questions which confront us. But their urgency has been largely increased during the last ten years by three facts:—

First, there is the rapid progress of Christianity in Africa and Asia. It is a matter of deep thankfulness that the main difficulties of the Church in the Mission field to-day arise not from her failures, but from her successes. It is the increase in the number of converts and the growth of the native Christians in education and spiritual life that are now calling for a change in our methods.

Then, in the second place, there is the rapid growth during the last few years of racial and national feeling in Africa and Asia. Races that seemed to be lying dormant have suddenly become inspired by a new spirit and felt the thrill of new hopes and ambitions. The new spirit is, in part, the result of Christian influence, and it is reacting strongly upon the Christian Church. If problems of independence and self-support were urgent ten years ago, they are far more urgent and pressing now.

And then, thirdly, there is the aggressive propaganda of Islam, which is challenging the Christian Church to a struggle for the possession of Equatorial Africa. In the face of that challenge the duty of evangelising Africa will not wait. The door is still open for the Christian Church; but if she fails to press through it, in a few years it will be shut.

These three facts call for greater efforts and for a careful review of existing methods of work, but not for any radical alteration of the general lines upon which the Mission work of our Church has been carried on for many years past. All that the Committee feel to be necessary is a frank recognition of the new conditions which are now coming into existence in the Mission field, the adaptation of some parts of our machinery to these new conditions, and at the same time the reaffirmation of principles which cannot give way to local customs or needs.

The recommendations of the Committee with reference to the various points brought before them are as follows:—

A.

The Growth of the Church on Racial and National Lines in (1) Asia, (2) Africa, and (3) America.

Baptism.

The question of the baptism of polygamists in Africa was carefully considered, and it was unanimously resolved that the Committee could not recommend either the modification or amplification of the pronouncement of the Lambeth Conference of 1888 on the whole question of polygamy.[1]

The danger of hasty admission of adults to the Church by Holy Baptism is generally recognised, and in most parts of the Mission field there is a period of preparation varying from one to three or four years. The time required for the preparation of catechumens must necessarily vary according to their intelligence and education: but it is important that every care should be taken to secure an intelligent belief in the Christian faith and an entire and willing acceptance of the Christian rule of moral life.

This is especially important where large masses of men and women come over to the Church in a body. They are often actuated by mixed motives when they put themselves under instruction for baptism, and it is essential that each candidate should be thoroughly taught and carefully tested before being admitted to the privileges of Holy Baptism.

The Prayer Book.

There is a widely felt desire in many parts of the Mission field for the adaptation of the Prayer Book or the extension of its provisions to meet the spiritual needs of the people, and a great deal of evidence was given on this point from different parts of the world. While fully recognising the educative value of the Book of Common Prayer, and the importance of retaining it as a bond of union and a standard of devotion, the Committee think that every effort should be made under due authority to render the forms of public worship more intelligible to uneducated congregations, and better suited to the widely diverse needs of the various races within the Anglican Communion.

Marriage.

The consideration of marriage problems belongs to another Committee, but as the question of marriages between Christians and non-Christians is of special importance in non-Christian coun-

[1] See above p. 133.

tries, it was considered by this Committee. The testimony given showed that in all parts of the Mission field such marriages are strongly discouraged, and in some cases absolutely forbidden under penalty of excommunication. In some dioceses in China it is the custom to excommunicate parents who give their daughters in marriage to non-Christians, because the marriages are arranged entirely by the parents, the daughter not being a free agent, and it is well-nigh impossible for the wife to remain a Christian when married to a non-Christian husband. And in most parts of India parents are similarly put under discipline for the marriage of their sons and daughters to non-Christian partners.

The Committee recommend that the penalty of excommunication should be inflicted when the marriages are celebrated with religious rites which are inconsistent with a profession of Christianity, or in cases where it is certain that such marriages will involve the practical renunciation of Christianity. The measure of discipline to be administered in other cases must be left to the discretion of diocesan authorities.

It was stated before the Committee that there is a desire in Western Equatorial Africa for the use of native forms of marriage, and that in South India the use of the *tali* or *mangalam* (*i.e.* a small metal disc suspended round the neck of the bride by a string) was sanctioned some years ago, instead of the ring, in deference to the strongly expressed desire of the people. The Committee see no reason why national and local Churches should not adopt native forms of marriage and consecrate them to a Christian use, provided (*a*) that the form used explicitly states that the union is lifelong and exclusive, (*b*) that the form is free from all heathen and idolatrous taint, and (*c*) that provision is made for the due registration of the marriage and for other formalities according to the law of the land, wherever such a law exists.

Adaptation of Native Customs.

This question of the use of native forms of marriage is only part of the much wider question of adapting native customs generally. It is undoubtedly true that in the past Christianity has involved a certain amount of denationalisation, and that missionaries have been far too ready to introduce Western customs and to discourage or suppress native customs which are in themselves harmless and have no necessary connection with idolatry or superstition. The result is that the Church comes to the people in a foreign dress, which prevents them from expressing their ideas and feelings in ways that are natural to them. The Committee reaffirm on this point Resolution 19 of the Lambeth Conference of 1897, "that it is important that, so far as possible, the Church should be adapted to local circumstances and the

people should be brought to feel in all ways that no burdens in the way of foreign customs are laid upon them." [1] In some parts of India the native system of panchayats (committees of five or more) has been successfully adapted for the administration of discipline, so that the discipline of the Church is administered, under the direction of the Bishop, by the people themselves, and this is what we ought to aim at in all matters which do not touch the essentials of Christian faith or conduct. We should encourage the people to do things in their own way, even though it may not be ideally the best way.

Self-support and Self-government.

Similarly every effort should be used to train native Churches and congregations in self-support and self-government, and, as far as possible, lead them to manage their own affairs. We are glad to report that considerable progress has been made in this important matter during the last ten years in all parts of the Mission field, but much still remains to be done, and the Committee regard it as of the utmost importance that missionaries should exercise a wise self-restraint and not allow their strength to become a source of weakness to their converts. There is no reason for alarm even if mistakes are made. It is far better that mistakes should be made, and bring with them the lessons of experience, than that the Native Christians should stagnate in a position of perpetual dependence. One important step, however, towards this ideal of self-government is the wider spread of theological knowledge, and the Committee are unanimous in thinking that an advanced theological training should be provided for the ablest of the Native Clergy, and that, if possible, those who show any aptitude for literary work should be enabled to devote their time largely to the production of vernacular theological literature.

Racial Problems.

The racial problems which have arisen in the extension of the Kingdom of God may from one point of view be even welcomed as evidence of the fact that many races have received the Gospel of Jesus Christ and are anxious to discharge their duties as members of His Church. They are but a sample of the difficulties which have arisen since primitive times, and which have been successfully overcome.

The Committee wish to lay down emphatically the principle of the unity of Christ's Church. All races and peoples, whatever their language or conditions, must be welded into the one Body, and the organisation of different races living side by side into

[1] See above p. 202.

separate or independent Churches on the basis of race or colour is quite inconsistent with the vital and essential principle of unity. But the problem presents itself in various parts of the world in such variety of form that it cannot be dealt with uniformly, even with the preservation of the principle which the Committee lay down as fundamental.

In countries like China and Japan, and large parts of Africa, the task before the Church is to build up an autonomous native Church, from the administration of which European or American missionaries should ultimately retire when their work is done. In Japan the Nippon Sei Kokwai is an organised National Church, in the government of which the English and American elements are manifestly temporary.

In India the problem is wholly different. A great variety of races, characterised by various religions, languages, conditions, have to be won to Christ and welded into one body, and to organise upon racial lines would be as fatal to the extension of Christ's Kingdom as was the condoning and allowance of caste in the eighteenth century. But this does not mean an ignoring of racial conditions in practical administration, so that the principle of unity be preserved. Self-support, with a large amount of autonomy in local administration, is universally recommended, and the Committee earnestly hope that the way will soon be clear for a further stage, viz.: the consecration to the Episcopate of Indians who may be either Diocesan Bishops in entire charge of comparatively small dioceses after the primitive model, or assistants to the English Diocesan Bishops, entrusted by them with the care of certain missions and pastorates, but in such a manner that the principle of unity between races is carefully guarded and preserved.

There seems to the Committee no reason why similar methods should not eventually be adopted in the province of South Africa, where there is a population of various races.

The problem reaches its acutest forms in a country where, as in the southern portion of the United States of America, the coloured population with equal civil rights forms a large proportion of the total population, and where the history of the past has led to conditions which accentuate the difficulty with which the living Church of the present has to deal. It is no part of the function of the Lambeth Conference to act as an executive body or as a court of appeal. Its function is simply to advise on principles, and leave independent authorities to deal with them, but the racial problem being found in such variety of form, it was referred to the Committee to deal with it expressly in reference to Asia, Africa, and America. The Committee sympathise profoundly with the Church in the United States in the difficulty which it has to solve, and trust that in the solution of this question (while

making provision to meet such racial requirements as may, under conditions now actually prevailing, demand separate arrangements for worship and service, and for freedom of development) there may be maintained real unity of the faith, obedience to a true ecclesiastical order, and conformity to the fundamental principle of the unity of all races in the one Body.

B.

Correlation and Co-operation of Missionary Agencies.

I. Missionary agencies connected with sister societies of the same Church may be grouped under two heads: (1) Foreign, *i.e.* working abroad; and (2) Home. On the first head the Committee desire to reaffirm and endorse the report of the Committee appointed to consider and report upon the subject of Foreign Missions in 1897 with reference to the relation of Missionary Bishops and Clergy to Missionary Societies,[1] and to express their thankfulness that the Societies have so administered their funds as to illustrate the principles before laid down. As between sister Societies the difficulties have been slight and transient. The Societies are but the handmaids of the one Church, and are seeking to build up autonomous Churches from which they may eventually retire when their missionary work is done.

But with respect to Home agencies the Committee feel that they may at once strike a note of thankfulness and plead for further advance. In England the formation of Diocesan Boards of Missions in connection with the Central Board of Missions (formerly known as the United Boards of Missions of the Provinces of Canterbury and York) has been the means of co-ordinating missionary agencies and enabling supporters of the various societies to realise their essential unity. Representatives of the Societies invariably serve on the Diocesan Boards, and the annual Diocesan Festival brings together for worship and conference those who are seeking to extend the Master's Kingdom abroad, whatever agency they may prefer. For this growth of fraternal feeling and kindly co-operation, and for the marked increase of interest in missionary work which has characterised the past decade, the Committee desire heartily to thank God. But they cannot but feel that there is still much to be done. If every member of the Church realised personal responsibility for extending the Master's Kingdom at home and abroad the present situation would not have arisen in England. It was the lack of it that brought the Societies into existence, for else Foreign Missions would have been neglected. Hence has arisen the overlapping of missionary agencies at home, each with its committee, secretaries, organising secretaries, deputations, and staff, and the placing of missionary effort on a wrong footing in the estimation of too many, as though

[1] See above p. 237.

it were simply a matter of choice and a response to the efforts of rival agencies rather than a fulfilment of a plain command from our Lord Jesus Christ. It is as the Church rises to a higher spiritual level and insists on doing its own work that the drawbacks will be removed. The whole deputation system in England will give way, the Committee hope, to a sounder system in which the clergy will not wait for deputations to visit their parishes, but will regard their Mission work as on precisely the same footing as the care of the sick and the young, glad enough to obtain from time to time the services of those who have been abroad and can testify of the work from personal experience, but not dependent on such visits for the efforts which they make; studying themselves the increasing literature that illustrates the work of Foreign Missions, and informing their people as to the progress of the Church of Christ, as a regular part of their pastoral work, and not only when special collections are made. When the Church at home rises to this higher level, much of the present overlapping of agencies will be avoided, the home expenditure of the Societies will be much reduced, the missionary vocation will be brought into greater prominence, and the essential unity of the work at home and abroad will be far better realised.

II. The correlation of missionary agencies representing sister Churches, as *e.g.* those of the English and American branches of the Anglican Communion, appears to the Committee to be in course of such practical solution in the Mission field as to require but little enforcement of principle. In Japan it is being practically solved by the formation of the Nippon Sei Kokwai, in which the English and American elements are happily blended with the Japanese. In China difficulties are but temporary, and are being solved. In South America there is no real conflict between jurisdictions, as the jurisdiction of the Bishop of the Falkland Islands, earlier in date, is simply personal, not territorial, in respect of English congregations in Brazil, and in no way conflicts with the jurisdiction of the American Bishop of Southern Brazil, whose work is of a different character.

But the Committee desire to recommend the Conference to reaffirm Resolution 24 of the Conference of 1897,[1] and further to resolve that, although it may be desirable to recognise in some cases and under certain special circumstances the episcopal care of a Bishop for his own countrymen within the jurisdiction of another Bishop of the Anglican Communion, yet the principle of one Bishop for one area is the ideal to be aimed at, and should be earnestly commended to all Bishops and Churches of the Anglican Communion as the best means of securing the unity of all races and nations in the Holy Catholic Church.

[1] See above p. 203.

III. The Committee are dealing with more difficult problems when they suggest correlation and co-operation between missionary agencies of the Anglican Communion and those of other bodies. Between the Mission of the Russian Church in Japan and the Nippon Sei Kokwai there exists happily perfect friendliness. The Committee regret that they must leave entirely alone the question of relationship between Missions of the Anglican Communion and those of the Roman Catholic Church. But as between Missions of the Anglican Communion and those of various non-episcopal Christian communities the Committee desire to offer some suggestions of a tentative character.

There may surely be placed in the forefront of such suggestions a grateful recognition of the real unity, despite all divisions, of the Christian Society in the face of all other (non-Christian) religions. All Christians baptized with water in accordance with Christ's command in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are baptised into the one Church of Christ. Conferences on methods of work have, as the Committee gratefully acknowledge, drawn together men and women of different bodies who are striving to evangelise the world, and have shown how much they have in common and how much they can learn from each other. Co-operation in education and in moral movements, such as temperance and social purity, and above all in the translation of the Scriptures as the common standard of the Christian faith to which all Christians appeal, and in much Christian literature, has been a further bond of union, and when all these uniting forces are reckoned up they form a link not easily to be broken.

Yet a frank recognition of denominational differences in matters of importance is no less necessary for a permanent understanding, and the Committee feel the necessity of recognising and guarding the right of Christians of any and every name to the ministrations of their several Churches, and the consequential right of a clergyman or minister of any Christian body to follow up and minister to his own people, wherever they may be found, without the suspicion of a breach of Christian charity.

Subject, however, to these rights, the Committee desire to make the following suggestions:—

(1) That it is much to be desired that there should be an understanding between Christian bodies engaged in evangelising the non-Christian world—

(*a*) That missionaries shall not without very strong reasons, except in large cities, begin new operations in a field already effectively occupied.

(*b*) That they shall not seek to attach to their own body those who are already Christians of other denominations, while at the same time they are fully justified in receiving to their own body, after due inquiry and communication with the proper authorities,

members of other bodies who *of their own accord* seek such admission.

(2) That there should be some agreement to prevent the possibility of persons disaffected on grounds of discipline from being transferred from one body to another.

The Committee note with pleasure the strong desire evidenced in various parts of the Mission field for a deeper union between Christian men and women divided on matters of moment but united by a yet stronger bond in their love of God in Jesus Christ our Lord, and they cannot but believe that the Foreign Mission field is likely to react upon the Church at home by teaching a truer proportion, widening the outlook, and strengthening the spiritual vision. Compromise of principle is no path to concord, but essentials and non-essentials are not always wisely discriminated, and the Committee believe that, though the present generation may not see the issue, the aspirations after a deeper unity will not be in vain, and that as in the West a time of disintegration is being followed by a time of consolidation, so in the East Christianity may take root without the perpetuation from generation to generation of the divisions of the West.

(Signed) EDGAR ALBAN:

Chairman.

APPENDIX I.

Endowments for Bishoprics.

The question was referred to the Committee whether it is desirable that Bishops should be appointed in the Mission field before an endowment is provided for them, and the Committee were strongly of opinion that the sending forth of missionary Bishops should be as free and unfettered as possible, and would deprecate any interference with the arrangements by which the missionary societies have hitherto undertaken the support of such Bishops, and would much regret the delay which must necessarily be incurred if an endowment for a missionary bishopric were insisted on as a prerequisite; at the same time they were also of opinion that no Bishop should be consecrated to a territorial Diocese until an endowment is provided or there is an assured and reasonable expectation of a permanent income.

APPENDIX II.

The Translation of the Name of our Lord in Countries subject to Mohammedan Influence.

The Committee, having had before it facts from widely distant parts of the Church as to the use of the form "Christ," or "Masih," or the equivalents of these, recommend the appointment by the Archbishop of Canterbury of a Committee (which may proceed by correspondence) to inquire and report to him, as President of the Lambeth Conference, upon the history of the term "Masih," its present connotation, and the question of the advisability of its use under the different circumstances of different branches of the Christian Church.

No. 5.

Report of the Committee[1] *appointed to Consider and Report upon the Subject of Prayer-Book Adaptation and Enrichment:* (a) *Rubrics, Text, Lectionary;* (b) Quicunque Vult.

The Committee have considered the fact that customs which fail to comply with the strict requirements of the rubrics are widely

[1] Names of the Members of the Committee :—

Bishop of Adelaide.
Bishop Anson.
Bishop of Bristol.
" Bunbury.
" Chester (*Chairman*).
" Columbia.
Bishop Courtney.
Bishop of Derby.
" Edinburgh.
" Ely.
" Gibraltar.
" Gloucester.
" Grahamstown.
" Grantham.*
Bishop Hamlyn.
Bishop of Kansas.
" Korea.
" Knaresborough (*Sec.*).
" Lebombo.
" Lexington.
" Lichfield.*
" Likoma.
" Llandaff.
Bishop Mather.
Bishop of Mexico.
" Mid China.
" Moray and Ross.
" Nassau.
" Osaka.
" Ottawa.
" Oxford.
" Pittsburgh.
" Rochester.
" St. Andrews.
" St. Helena.
" St. John's, Kaffraria.
" Sierra Leone.
" Sodor and Man.
" Southern Brazil.
" South Tokyo.*
" Springfield.
Archbishop of Sydney.
Bishop Thornton.
Bishop of Vermont.
" Worcester.
" Zanzibar.

prevalent, and that such deviations from plain rule, although in many instances they have become desirable, tend to weaken the authority of those who have to enforce discipline when serious irregularities have to be dealt with.

The Committee are of opinion that it is expedient that rubrics should be brought, as far as possible, into line with general practice, except of course where the deviation arises from negligence, or is in other respects hurtful. They proceed to give illustrations of what may be done, but it must be remembered that this list of illustrations is not intended to be exhaustive.

A very general omission is that of the Exhortation at the time of the Celebration of Holy Communion, beginning "Dearly beloved in the Lord." This practice has been gradually adopted on the ground of convenience, especially where there are frequent celebrations. The rubric might be so altered as to relax the present rule, while still prescribing the occasional reading of the Exhortation.

Again, the introduction of the verses said or sung before and after the Gospel has no sanction from the rubrics of the English Prayer Book. This almost universal custom should be formally authorised, as it is already in the Irish, Scottish, and partly in the American, Churches.

By an almost universal custom the prayers of the Church on behalf of certain sick and afflicted persons are asked before the Litany, before the "Prayer for all Conditions of Men," and also, in many churches, before the Prayer for "the whole state of Christ's Church." Such a rubric as was suggested by the Convocations of Canterbury and York in 1879 might be added at each of these places,[1] and a similar rubric might be placed before the General Thanksgiving.

Parts of the Exhortation which forms the preface to the English office of Holy Matrimony are frequently omitted. It is desirable that any such deviation from rule, if made at all, should be made under authority, and should not be left to the discretion of the clergyman. But it appears to the Committee that relief from the difficulty should be sought in a revision of the language of the Exhortation, similar to that of the Irish Prayer Book, rather than by the authorised omission of any of the existing words.

In this connection it may be suggested that the language of some prayers in various parts of the Prayer Book might well be brought into more real relation to changed conditions of life and modes of thought.

Passing now to matters which more seriously affect the structure of the services, we first note that, without breach of ancient

[1] "When the Prayers for the Church are desired for any, the Minister may at his discretion here give notice of the same."—"Convocation Prayer Book," pp. 62, 74, 267 *f.*

liturgical precedent, undue repetition or redundancy might be avoided by means of certain omissions.

The repeated saying of the Lord's Prayer, when two or more services are combined, has been frequently criticised. The Committee suggest that where services are taken consecutively some readjustment should be made in this respect.

Again, the frequent occurrence of prayers for the King is a case of redundancy which constantly calls for remark. The omission of the Prayer for the King after the Decalogue in the Communion Office would, the Committee believe, meet with almost universal approval.

The Committee now come to additions by way of enrichment. Much valuable guidance in this regard is available from the American, Scottish, and Irish Service Books.

Additional suffrages might be added in the Litany—*e.g.* for Parliament, for the Ministers of the Crown, and for the sending forth of labourers into the harvest.

There is urgent need for the appointment of some Collect, such as the latter of the two Ember Collects, for use in parish churches on the Sunday or Holy Day fixed for Ordinations. The rubric for the use of a Collect during the Ember weeks does not provide for this. The special suffrage in the Litany from the Ordinal might also, with slight modification, be sanctioned for use in every parish church upon the day of Ordination.

There is room for considerable enrichment in the Occasional Prayers and Thanksgivings. Prayers are needed, at least in the English Book, for Rogation Days, for Missions (both Home and Foreign), for Schools and Colleges, for Convocations and Synods of the Church, for our Brethren and Friends in other lands, for our Army and Navy, and for our Mercantile Marine. To many Churchmen, moreover, a brief commemoration of the faithful in Paradise would be inexpressibly welcome. The Irish Prayer Book supplies such a prayer. Greater opportunities for the use of these prayers would be provided by the shorter form of Litany which is suggested below.

Further enrichment might be secured by the development of a method which was occasionally adopted by the compilers of the Prayer Book—namely, that of providing alternative forms.

A substitute for the *Venite* is provided in the anthems prescribed on Easter Day, and similar anthems might well be provided for all the greater festivals. Additional Proper Prefaces might also be supplied in the Communion Office in accordance with earlier usage.

The length of the Litany is undoubtedly one of the causes which

have led to its frequent omission, and we suggest that a rubric similar to that of the American Church is advisable, allowing the Minister at his discretion to shorten the latter part thereof. This would afford opportunity for a more frequent use of the occasional prayers. The Committee are of opinion that, by thus allowing alternative endings to the Litany, an important step would be taken towards greater elasticity in our prayers.

Once more, our Lord's Summary of the Law might be allowed as an occasional alternative to the Decalogue, with such response or prayer as may be thought desirable.

In order to provide greater variety and elasticity in our Services, the Committee suggest the permission of a shortened form of Mattins and Evensong for use when another Service is combined therewith.

One object to be kept in view would be to provide Services which could be combined, in the case of Mattins, with an Administration of Holy Communion, and, in the case of Evensong, with the public celebration of Holy Baptism, without undue length of Service.

It is further suggested that such alteration of the rubrics concerning the Administration of Holy Communion should be made as to allow, at the discretion of the Minister, alternative uses of the prescribed words when the number of communicants is large.

With a view to allowing greater elasticity in public worship, the Committee recommend the arrangement of Services of "Bidding to Prayer," in which the Minister should ask the prayers of the people for various subjects and in special emergencies, interposing after the mention of each subject a pause for silence, followed by a collect or prayer by the Minister.

The Committee are, moreover, of opinion that any future revision of the Book of Common Prayer should include a change of words which are obscure and commonly misunderstood, such as "hell," "wealth," "damnation," "indifferently."

Lastly, they desire to add that the Calendar and Tables prefixed to the Book of Common Prayer are urgently in need of revision, which should include, among other things, the insertion of some national Saints.

It will be observed that the Committee have not dealt in this Report with such large questions as those of the Ornaments Rubric and of the structure and contents of the Prayer of Consecration, because they felt that the time at their disposal was insufficient.

C C

As regards the PSALTER—

(1) The Committee would recommend a larger provision of *Proper Psalms* for Sundays and Holydays. The American Prayer Book provides for sixteen days instead of six, which are all that the English Book gives. Similar Tables of additional Proper Psalms were recommended by the Convocation of York in 1879, and others have been set forth by various Bishops for use in their Dioceses.

(2) The American Prayer Book also contains twenty *Selections of Psalms* in groups, which may be used at the discretion of the minister in place of the Psalms for the day of the month; such a plan is thought to provide—

(*a*) An alternative for the use of the Comminatory Psalms, which are a serious cause of difficulty and distress to many devout and thoughtful persons;

(*b*) An alternative for the recitation of Psalms that, coming in ordinary course, may be inappropriate to the day or season, or to the particular occasion.

(3) Another proposal has been suggested which deserves consideration—namely, such a system of reciting the whole Psalter as would allow of fixed Psalms being assigned to each day of the week.

As regards the LECTIONARY—

(1) So much has been gained by revisions of the Lectionary, both in England and in America, during the last half-century that, while grateful for these improvements, the Committee think that further revision would be of advantage.

(2) Greater liberty in the choice of Lessons might well be given, provided that the principle is safeguarded by which "all the whole Bible (or the greatest part thereof) should be read over once every year." Such liberty is given in the American Church, and suggestions have been made which are worthy of consideration for a change in the arrangement of the daily Lessons, by which the continuous course of reading, according to the day of the month, may be modified by appropriate books of Holy Scripture being assigned to different seasons, and Lessons appointed for the several days of successive weeks. This would be an extension to other seasons (such as the Epiphany and Lent) of the present arrangement, in accordance with which Isaiah and the Apocalypse are read in Advent.

It has been strongly urged upon the Committee: "That, pending further emendation of the English version of the Bible, it is desirable that steps should be taken for allowing the use of

the Revised Version wherever Scripture is quoted or recited or directed to be read, in the Book of Common Prayer." The Committee are not prepared to recommend this proposal in its entirety, but they regard the subject as worthy of consideration.

The result of the deliberations of the Committee upon the subject of *Occasional Services* appears in the Resolution on that subject.[1]

Quicunque vult.

The Committee, having had under consideration the liturgical use of the *Quicunque vult*, would point out that the existing divergence of practice in the various churches of the Anglican Communion, together with Resolution 11 B [2] of the Lambeth Conference of 1888, show that the use or disuse of this Hymn cannot be made one of the terms of communion.

Various proposals for meeting the difficulties connected with public recitation of the *Quicunque vult* which are felt in many quarters, were placed before the Committee. Of these one was considered, but it was eventually determined not to make any general recommendation as to the use or disuse of the Creed to the Conference.

(Signed) F. J. Cestr:

Chairman.

[1] See p. 323; Resolution 28.

[2] "That, in the opinion of this Conference, the following articles supply a basis on which approach may be by God's blessing made towards Home Reunion:—

* * * * * * *

"(B) The Apostles' Creed, as the Baptismal Symbol; and the Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith."

No. 6.

Report of the Committee[1] *appointed to Consider and Report upon the Subject of the Conditions Requisite to the Due Administration of the Holy Communion.*

Your Committee have believed that they may best fulfil the purpose for which they were appointed if they limit somewhat closely the subject assigned to them, and restrict their deliberation and their report to the special subject of the Administration of the Holy Communion, and the conditions which should be required in order that the Sacrament may be duly administered. They have therefore excluded from their consideration the questions which concern the requisite qualifications for the reception of the Sacrament. They have also refrained from inquiry concerning the requisite qualifications for the minister of the Sacrament and concerning the words of administration. They believe that this last question falls properly within the scope of the Committee appointed to consider the Adaptation of the Prayer Book.

In entering upon the task which they have thus restricted, your Committee have decided that the most convenient division of the subject is that which is suggested by the chief questions and difficulties recently raised in connection with it. Adopting this division, they have now to make their Report—

(i) On the question raised by those who urge that infectious diseases may be spread by the use of one chalice for a number of communicants;

(ii) On the request that in remote Mission stations, where it is impossible or extremely difficult to obtain wheaten bread or wine made from the fruit of the vine, the use of some other matter for the Sacrament should be authorised.

[1] Names of the Members of the Committee :—

Bishop of Aberdeen.
" Argyll.
" Bristol.
" Duluth.*
" Durham.
" Fuh-kien.
" Gibraltar.
" Harrisburg.
" Kansas.
" Liverpool.
" Marquette.
" Ossory.
" Oxford (*Chairman*).
Bishop of Pittsburgh.
" Sacramento.
" Sodor and Man.
" Southern Ohio.*
" Southwell.
" Southwark.
Bishop Thornton.
Bishop of Tinnevelly.
" Tokyo.
" Travancore (*Secretary*).
" Uganda.
" Zanzibar.

(i) With regard to the former question, your Committee, having received the help of important testimony with high medical authority, believe that, save in extraordinary circumstances, the risk of infection being conveyed by the chalice is far less than that which is constantly and unhesitatingly incurred in the circumstances and intercourse of daily life. As scientific investigation discloses more and more of the multitudinous possibilities of disease besetting human life under its present conditions, there is need to hold a middle course between carelessness on the one hand and panic or a paralysing solicitude on the other: and freedom or ease of mind in social life would be almost impossible if men were to recoil from every risk of infection which can be suggested to them. Your Committee believe that it is not necessary, on the ground of any dread of such risk, to make any change in the received manner of administration; that it would be unwise to recognise and encourage by such a change an alarm which should be met by the exercise of common-sense.

In special cases, where exceptional circumstances seem to require a departure from the usual manner of administration, your Committee advise that counsel and direction should be sought from the Bishop of the Diocese.

(ii) The difficulty which may arise with regard to the due administration of the Holy Communion in Mission fields which are remote and hard to reach has been brought before your Committee vividly and impressively in the case of Uganda. Not long ago the problem confronting the Church in Uganda with regard to the celebration of the Sacrament stood thus: there were hundreds (where now there are thousands) of native Christians baptized and confirmed, and prepared, accustomed and desiring to receive the Holy Communion; the vine cannot at present be successfully cultivated there; every drop of wine had to be brought from the coast, a distance of a thousand miles; it had to be carried by porters, and the journey took five months; while a law, passed simply for the good of the natives, forbade altogether the introduction of wine into the country. Some of those conditions are now considerably changed; and it is probable that no other Mission of the Church has to meet on so large a scale the intractable difficulties which beset the Church in Uganda. But there the problem has been plainly urgent; it is possible that with more or less urgency it may elsewhere recur, on particular occasions, if not on a large scale, as the Mission work of the Church is carried forward, and vast fields as yet untouched are penetrated and claimed for Christ.

The Committee recognise that in any such case as that of Uganda those who bear rule in the Mission have to face a problem of intense anxiety and to undertake a tremendous responsibility.

No one who tries to realise the dilemma with which a Bishop may be thus confronted can fail to feel deep sympathy with one who finds added to the other difficulties of his work the burden of deciding whether he will refuse to Christ's people the great means of grace which Christ ordained for them, or alter according to the exigency of the case the order received in the Church whose minister he is. It is with no lack of such sympathy that your Committee have felt bound to refrain from recommending the authorisation of the departure which has in some cases been made from that order. The burden of responsibility may thus be left with those who have borne it; but the Committee are of opinion that it is better so to leave it; and they trust that for the sake of the Church it may be borne with wisdom and with patience, and that those who bear it may be guided in each crisis of decision to decide according to God's will.

(Signed) F. Oxon,

Chairman.

No. 7.

Report of the Committee[1] *appointed to Consider and Report upon the Subject of Ministries of Healing:* (a) *The Unction of the Sick;* (b) *Faith Healing and "Christian Science."*

Your Committee, which has had under consideration "Ministries of Healing," has felt itself at a disadvantage in discussing phenomena which only in recent times have been the subject of scientific

[1] Names of the Members of the Committee:—

Bishop of Chicago.
" Chota Nagpur.
" Columbia.
" Dorking.
" Edinburgh.
" Ely.
" Gloucester.
" Lebombo.
" Los Angeles (*Secretary*).
" Massachusetts.
" Ohio.
Bishop of Rochester.
" Southern Florida.
" Springfield.
" Stepney.
" Thetford.
" Wellington.
" Western China.
Bishop Coadjutor of Western Virginia.
Bishop of Winchester (*Chairman*).

investigation. In the present stage of knowledge it would be premature for any except experts to hazard an opinion upon such topics as the powers of "Mental Suggestion" and the range of "Subliminal Consciousness," or to attempt to forecast the possibilities of "Mental" or "Spiritual Healing."

The Committee would desire to state at the outset that it has been very materially assisted by highly valuable communications upon modern "mental" or "spiritual therapeutics," which were supplied most kindly by two eminent English physicians. It has had abundant access to the existing literature which has grown up in connection with the whole subject entrusted to it. Upon the "Anointing of the Sick" the Committee was fortunate in being able to consult, in addition to the standard authorities, some valuable memoranda supplied by learned living scholars.

In every age the Church has regarded ministrations to the sick as among the most sacred and important of its pastoral duties. Your Committee trusts that the Anglican clergy are in this respect steadfastly maintaining that high standard of practical ministry which has been one of the great glories of their tradition. If, as has been alleged, disproportionate emphasis has sometimes been laid upon the preparation for death, this is a tendency which should be corrected by the more general encouragement of a happy and trustful Christian spirit.

The Committee believes that Christ still fulfils in Christian experience His power to give life, and to give it more abundantly; and that the faith, which realises His Presence, is capable of creating a heightened vitality of spirit, which strengthens and sustains the health of the body. The Committee believes that sickness and disease are in one aspect a breach in the harmony of the Divine purpose, not only analogous to, but sometimes at least caused by, want of moral harmony with the Divine Will; and that this restoration of harmony in mind and will often brings with it the restoration of the harmony of the body. It believes that sickness has too often exclusively been regarded as a cross to be borne with passive resignation, whereas it should have been regarded rather as a weakness to be overcome by the power of the Spirit.

The Committee believes that the Church possesses in the teaching of the doctrine of the Incarnation the message which our age requires, viz., that the whole of Creation is included in the work of Redemption, and that the body, no less than the spirit, of man received the eternal benediction of the Lord when He took our nature upon Him. The Committee believes, also, that the full potency of corporate intercession has been too little realised, and that the confidence in the efficacy of prayer for restoration to health has not been sufficiently encouraged.

I.

Without going so far as to say that the spread, during the last decade, of phases of thought dwelling upon mental and spiritual healing is to be attributed to the shortcomings of the Church, it may be that estrangement on the part of some has resulted from omissions in the teaching of many of her ministers respecting the true spiritual life of the Church and of the fruit to be expected from it.

Undoubtedly, in the case of many of those who have come under the influence of such phases of thought, a very remarkable effect has been produced; they have been helped physically and mentally, their general health has been improved, disorders have been controlled or removed altogether.

On the other hand, with reference to definite and, indeed, aggressive systems, such as that which describes itself as Christian Science, the Committee considers that the claim to heal all manner of diseases and organic troubles has not been substantiated, while suffering has been caused, with many deaths, by the refusal to allow the sick, children as well as adults, to profit by medical attendance and care. Moreover, while desiring to express sympathy with those whose needs may not have been adequately met within the Church, the Committee believes that a grave and emphatic warning ought to be uttered against the peril of being thoughtlessly drawn into alliance, in the desire for health, with any who, under whatever attractive name, are in antagonism with the Christian faith upon such subjects as the Incarnation, the Resurrection, the reality of Sin, and the use of the Holy Sacraments.

II.

There are many members of the Church, both clerical and lay, in the United States, in Great Britain, and elsewhere, who practise "Spiritual Healing" in one or other of its modern forms. It necessarily lies outside the province of the Committee to sift the evidence that has been adduced as to cures, in the performance of which their action had been instrumental. Such evidence would be tested properly only by trained scientific experts.

Many need to be reminded that psychic forces are not the same as spiritual, and that there is real danger lest certain mental or psychic powers by which others are helped, and which are developed in certain persons, should be regarded as gifts of a special or supernatural character, whereas they are rather to be looked upon as natural gifts in the same category as art or music.

In the present phase of inquiry, expectation, and experiment, the Committee earnestly urges that prayer should be made that

the Holy Spirit will guide the Church to a just judgment upon the whole subject, to the right appreciation, the patient study, and the prudent exercise of any powers which may clearly be established as gifts of God.

The Committee would not wish to say a word in disparagement or discouragement of those who may be pioneers in a new branch of service, but it believes it would for the present be unwise to depart from an attitude of watchfulness and reserve; and it is not therefore prepared to recommend that at the present stage any authoritative recognition should be given to those who claim to exercise these "Gifts of Healing."

The Committee feels it a duty to add the following note of warning. Those who believe themselves to be endowed with the gift of healing power should be urged diligently to fit and prepare themselves, by constant prayer and by scientific medical study, for its proper and safe exercise, in order that there should be no room for reproach or suspicion on the ground of ignorance or inexperience; and it is of extreme importance that, if not medically qualified to practise, they should act with the approval, or under the supervision, of qualified medical practitioners. Moreover, they should be cautioned against the temptation, to which those who believe themselves to be endowed with such exceptional powers are specially exposed, to wander into the dangerous ground of occultism and spiritualism.

III.

Every member of the Church should be urged to consecrate the improved conditions of knowledge and skill to the glory of God, and by continual prayer and intercession to bring the use of each fresh gift, whether of healing or of experience, into closer harmony with the mind of the Great Physician, the Saviour of Body, Soul, and Spirit.

The Committee desires to place on record its thankfulness to Almighty God for the wonderful works of healing which have been wrought during the past century through medical, surgical, and hygienic discovery, through the development of the hospital system, and through the training and ministration of nurses. The Committee believes that medical science is the handmaid of God and His Church, and should be fully recognised as the ordinary means appointed by Almighty God for the care and healing of the human body. The Committee believes that discoveries in the region of medicine and surgery come to man through Him who is the Light and the Life, the Divine Word.

IV.

Returning to the subject of the ordinary pastoral ministrations of the clergy to sick persons, the Committee recommends the addition to the Office for the Visitation of the Sick of more hopeful and less ambiguous petitions for the restoration of health, always subject to the Will of God, than this Office at present supplies; and that these petitions be used in close connection with prayer for pardon and peace. It is hoped that, during the period which must intervene before any such alteration can be carried out, endeavours will be made to give effect to the spirit of this recommendation.

The Committee is of opinion, that the prayers for the restoration of health which it recommends, may be fitly accompanied by the apostolic act of the Laying-on of Hands.

V.

The Committee has carefully considered the suggestion that these prayers should be accompanied by the anointing of the sufferer with oil.

The Biblical authority for this practice, as found in St. Mark vi. 13, and St. James v. 14, has undoubtedly great significance for those members of the Church who look to the letter of Holy Scripture as their rule of life. It should be clearly pointed out that St. James emphatically connects the "saving" of the sick with the "Prayer of Faith," of which the anointing was an accompaniment. Further, in view of the absence of any record of the anointing with oil either by our Lord Himself or by His disciples after Pentecost, except so far as is implied in the passage from St. James just referred to, it cannot be assumed with certainty that the rite commended by St. James was intended for general or lasting use. The application of oil was common at that time for medicinal purposes, and oil was therefore an appropriate symbol of healing.

Moreover, so far as the Committee is aware, there is no clear proof of the use of unction for the sick in the Christian Church until the fourth century. It was then frequently practised, mainly with a view to bodily healing; but it should be noted that other outward symbols of healing were also employed, *e.g.*, bread, water, clay. There is evidence that until the sixth century unction was administered, and the oil blessed, not by the clergy only, but also by laymen and women of reputed sanctity. After that century the blessing of the oil, at any rate, appears in the West to have been restricted to Bishops, while in the East it was permitted that the oil should be consecrated by the Presbyters. From the end of

the eighth century onwards, unction was employed in the West as part of the preparation for death.

In view of this evidence and the conditions prevailing in the Church at the present time, the Committee is not prepared to recommend the restoration of the unction of the sick, but it does not wish to go so far as to advise the prohibition of its use, if it be earnestly desired by the sick person. In all such cases the parish priest should seek the counsel of the Bishop of the Diocese. Care must be taken that no return be made to the later custom of anointing as a preparation for death.

(Signed) HERBERT E. WINTON:
Chairman.

No. 8.

Report of the Committee[1] *appointed to Consider and Report upon the Subject of Marriage Problems:* (a) *Divorce;* (b) *Prohibited Degrees;* (c) *Restriction on Population.*

Your Committee appointed to consider Marriage Problems beg leave to report as follows:—

[1] Names of Members of the Committee:—

Bishop of Albany.
" Auckland.
" Bunbury.
" Bangor.
" Bristol (*Chairman*).
" Carpentaria.
" Derry.
" Exeter.
" Gibraltar.
" Grahamstown (*Secretary*).
" Harrisburg.
" Huron.
" Kensington.
" Kingston-upon-Thames.
" Lahore.*
" Leicester.
" Madras.
Bishop of Mauritius.
" Nagpur.
" New Westminster.
Bishop Coadjutor of New York.
Bishop of Olympia.
Bishop Coadjutor of Pennsylvania.
Bishop of Reading.
" Rhode Island.
" Ripon.
" Riverina.
" South Japan.
" Spokane.*
" Swansea.*
" Truro.
" Utah.
" Western New York.
" Worcester.

I.

Divorce.

The successive Lambeth Conferences have grown more and more emphatic in utterance on the sanctity of marriage as the root of the family life, and the family life as the basis of social order.

The Conference of 1908 finds itself in presence of a sharp contrast. From all parts of the Mission field the fact is borne in upon them that the missionary treats the development of the ideas of sanctity of marriage and family life as the foundation on which he builds the social regeneration of the race. On the other hand, the sanctity of marriage is being violated openly in civilised societies; and there is an avowed determination on the part of persons of extreme opinions to press to the front their advocacy of the complete abolition of the tie of marriage.

The function of the Church in these matters can be stated quite simply. The Church does not make the marriage. The marriage is made by the man and the woman, their consent being duly certified. The function of the Church is threefold: To bear public witness to the fact of the marriage; to pronounce the blessing of Almighty God upon the pair who have of their own accord entered upon the holy estate of matrimony, instituted by God himself; and ever after to guard the sanctity of the marriage bond so long as they both shall live.

It is impossible to note with other than the greatest pain and the gravest condemnation the ease with which in these modern times divorces are obtained, and the frequency of the cases in which the husband and the wife are in collusion in the appeal to the courts of law.

So far as alleged reasons for divorce are concerned, the Committee unhesitatingly declare that in their judgment there is at most but one cause for which a marriage rightly performed and also consummated ought ever to be broken by a court of law. That cause is, to employ without discussion the phrase of a former Conference, "fornication or adultery." In some States of the United States of America the causes for which divorce is allowed are so numerous and so frivolous, that a rising wave of opposition has been called into existence. The steady pressure of the cleanest public opinion in favour of a diminution in the number of causes is being applied to the legislatures, already with no inconsiderable success. We would counsel our brethren there, and wheresoever in the world there is such necessity, never to rest until they have purified the law of divorce by the excision of all causes save the one.

For the formation of a clean public opinion, and for its practical outcome in the refusal to be in social relations with adulterers

and adulteresses, the Committee would most earnestly appeal to clean-living women in all the many ranks and grades of life. Pure women are the great human power for good in this cause, and not in this cause only. They can apply a punishment which will soon prove to be remedial in its effect; they can refuse to have social relations with adulteress or adulterer. If they will be brave in this vital matter, the Committee are clearly of opinion that the flood of evil can be stemmed and turned.

It is well known that there is a difference of opinion on the question whether the really (or technically) innocent person should be allowed to marry in church with the Church's Service. It appears to a majority of the Committee that the objection to saying the solemn words over a person whose wedlock man has sundered, "Those whom God hath joined together let not man put asunder," is very great. It is a grievous misfortune that in so many cases the really innocent person does not exist. The suggestion that the guilty person might be allowed to marry in church, the Committee unanimously condemn.

II.

Prohibited Degrees.

In modern times matrimony has passed in most countries from the legislative and judicial control of the Church to that of the State.

But the Church's duty of guarding and enforcing morality, and the close correlation between marriage questions and moral questions, make it impossible for the Church to abdicate responsibility for the marriage law, or rather for the principles regarding marriage which are to guide members of the Church.

The right to define the degrees within which marriage is prohibited, formerly exercised by the Church alone, is nowadays claimed and exercised by the State. This is pre-eminently the case in the United States, where the Church has no list of prohibited degrees, these being left to be dealt with by each State.

In the Church of England the Table of Prohibited Degrees (compiled by Archbishop Parker) is derived from the pre-Reformation Canon Law, which binds clergy and laity alike, except so far as it is overridden by Statutes of the Realm. The law embodied in the Table is based upon earlier statute law (32 Henry VIII. c. 38), and is incorporated in Canon 99 of 1603, which binds the clergy, but does not *proprio vigore* (in law as distinct from conscience) bind the laity. The Table comprises a part only of the list of degrees prohibited by the older Canon Law the rest (including, *e.g.* the prohibition of the marriage of first cousins) being abrogated by statute.

In Ireland, Scotland, and most of the Colonial churches this reformed table has been expressly adopted by local canons.

The Act of the Imperial Parliament of 1907 has legalised marriage with a deceased wife's sister, and accordingly, so far as concerns this one prohibited degree, the Canon (99) above mentioned is now no longer in correspondence with statute law.

In many of the Colonies, not only does a similar discrepancy exist, but, in other degrees also, unions forbidden by the canons of the Church are allowed by the laws of the State.

Any such discrepancy raises a twofold question: (1) Is the marriage in question, though permitted by the law of the land, prohibited by divine law? and (2) (if the foregoing question be answered in the negative) may not the Church, nevertheless, rightly enforce, in the case of its own members, its own prohibitions; and is it not bound, until it has repealed them by its own act, to enforce them? If the latter question is answered in the affirmative, the further question arises, How is this to be done?

Your Committee take it as beyond dispute that there are degrees, such as those in the direct line of ascent or descent, within which marriage is prohibited by the law of God (as read in Holy Scripture and in the immemorial instincts of civilised mankind), so that the Church has no power to modify or to dispense from such prohibitions.

Applying what has been said to the particular prohibition recently removed from the English Statute-book, the opinion is held by some of your Committee that this is a prohibition of divine and immutable obligation. Your Committee recognise that this opinion has influenced ecclesiastical action, and that the prohibition of marriage with a deceased wife's sister has had a salutary effect as an outwork in protecting the divine law from encroachments, and thus upholding the sanctity of marriage, so seriously menaced by much hasty and ill-advised legislation in many countries.

There are many who, while they no longer maintain the divine and immutable character of this prohibition, yet feel very strongly the obligation of enforcing the unrepealed law of the Church, and, as regards England, reject the contention that the canon, in this respect, is constructively repealed by the Act of 1907. The terms of the Act (which give the clergy the right to refuse to celebrate such marriages or to allow their celebration in their churches, and explicitly leave them subject to any ecclesiastical censures to which they might have been subject had the Act not been passed) may fairly be said to lend countenance to this latter view.

At the same time, it must be allowed that as a matter of legal

obligation the unrepealed prohibition now, strictly speaking, binds the clergy only.

The case of the Churches of Ireland, Scotland, and the Colonies, is different.

In any case, we are of opinion that marriage with a deceased wife's sister, where permitted by the law of the land, and at the same time prohibited by the canons of the Church, is to be regarded, not as a non-marital union, but as marriage ecclesiastically irregular while not constituting the parties "open and notorious evil livers." This is especially the case in countries such as Japan and India, where marriage with a deceased wife's sister is not only permitted, but is in many cases a matter of customary obligation.

In conclusion, we have to place upon record our opinion that it is within the competence of a local Church to make its own conditions with regard to prohibited degrees, so that they be not repugnant to the law of God. But we earnestly invite all Churches to unite in withstanding the prevailing flood of laxity of practice and thought in all matters affecting marriage. To do so with real effect our rebuke must be firm and strong; but strong it cannot be unless it is also measured.

III.

Restriction on Population.

We have to report on the question of the Artificial Restriction of Population. In every Western country there has been a decline in the birth-rate; but this decline has been most marked among the English-speaking people, once the most fertile of races. Thus comparing the birth-rate of 1894–8 with that of 1874–8, the decrease in Norway was 4 per cent., in France 14 per cent., in the United Kingdom 15 per cent., or if we exclude Scotland and Ireland, the decrease in England and Wales was 17 per cent. England and Wales, therefore, have suffered a greater proportionate decline than any other European country. The Colonies of Great Britain follow the steps of the mother-country. Mr. Coghlan, the Statistician-General of Australia, reckons that marriage fertility, which in 1886 was represented by 339, had fallen in 1901 to 235. In New Zealand the birth-rate fell from 37·32 in 1882 to 25·6 in 1900; so great was the fall that it was said that there were not children enough to fill the schools. There has been a slight increase since 1900; the rate in 1906 was 27·08. With the exception of the French population, the birth-rate in Canada exhibits a similar serious decline. In the United States the decline in the birth-rate is declared by Dr. J. S. Billings to be greater than in any other country. It is important to notice

that the decline appears to be chiefly among the old English-speaking stocks. In the city of Providence, for example, where vital statistics are favourable, two-thirds of the families belong to the native stock and one-third to foreign stocks; but of the children born two-thirds belong to the foreign stocks and only one-third to the native stock.

Causes.

Many causes have been alleged for this decline in the birth-rate; some of these, such as the tendency to marry at a later age than formerly, have no doubt influenced the birth-rate; but it is admitted beyond all power of dispute that it is largely due to the loss of the sense of responsibility to God for the fruits of marriage resulting in deliberate avoidance or prevention of child-bearing. "Preventive abortion has taken the place of direct abortion, and is daily growing more frequent in England and America." Medical men are constantly consulted by those who desire to avoid the burden of a family; the old reserve of modesty has largely disappeared; the medical evidence given before the New South Wales Commission showed that not only was restriction practised, but that the habit of it was regarded without shame or abhorrence; the Malthusian Society openly advocates the practice; newspapers contain advertisements in which appliances for the purpose are offered for sale, and in which experts seek public patronage by announcing the number of their successes in this malpractice.

Resultant Evils.

The moral evil of this habit claims our first attention. We are glad to notice that the New South Wales Commission commented on "the grave immorality of deliberately preventing conception." The habit, in the view of the Commission, tended to "undermine the morality of the people, to loosen the bonds of religion, and to obliterate the influence of those higher sentiments and sanctions for conduct with which the development of high national character has ever been associated." Abstention from marriage is within a man's moral right; self-restraint in marriage is within his right; but to marry with the deliberate intention of defeating one of the chief ends of marriage is to deprave the ideal of marriage.

The verdict of Nature appears to endorse the moral instinct which condemns these practices, for there is good reason to believe that the use of artificial methods of prevention is associated with serious local ailments. In the view of many eminent physiologists the ill-effects of the habit resemble those of self-abuse, and nervous enfeeblement follows. The mental and moral vigour may become

impaired, and the question has been asked whether the increase of insanity may not be closely connected with these habits of restriction.

Some Popular Mistakes.

We frankly recognise that there are cases in which the habit of restriction is due to the natural wish to spare the wife from suffering; but it is open to doubt whether the practice of prevention does not entail far more suffering than can arise from allowing Nature to take her course. Many doctors concur in the view of a well-known writer on this subject, who says that in one day more misery and suffering arise from the abuse of the married state than could be found in a month from uncomplicated child-bearing.

We are ready to admit that parental love of children already born may be pleaded against the burden of an enlarged family; but without dwelling upon the opportunities of unconscious education which belong to large families, we venture to protest very earnestly against the foolishness of the love which seeks to save children from the necessity of personal exertion and is ambitious to start them in life with the same resources which have been won by their parents through industry and self-denial. It is a mistaken kindness to attempt to protect the young from the wholesome discipline of life.

The Prevalence and Dangers of the Habit.

We must dismiss from our minds the belief that restriction is due to the pressure of necessity; the evidence which we have had before us convinces us that the practice prevails more among the well-to-do than among the poor. The inducing motive is not foresight under the stress of poverty; it is rather to be found in what the French writers call social capillarity, but which we prefer to call social ambition; it arises from the wish to escape burdens which might lessen social prestige or limit the opportunities of pleasure; it is a symptom of the spirit which shirks responsibility and resents self-denial, and which results in the weakening of character.

When we realise the widely spreading influence of this spirit and the disastrous results of this habit, we cannot wonder that grave apprehensions begin to prevail among thoughtful people. In France, a Parliamentary Commission was appointed in 1901 to consider the matter. In Canada the alarm has led to a solemn pronouncement on the part of the Bishops, warning against that "godless spirit which seeks to regulate at will the results of marriage, and largely to banish childhood from the home."

The dangers of the practice are to us sadly and clearly evident. There is the danger of the loosening of home ties, for, to use the language of the Pastoral Letter of the Australian Bishops, this habit, which degrades the holy estate of matrimony, "is a fruitful source of discontent, unfaithfulness, and divorce." There is the danger of physical ills, and there is the worse danger of character enfeeblement—and character is, far beyond riches, the best asset of nations. There is the danger of deterioration whenever the race is recruited from the inferior and not from the superior stocks. There is the world-danger that the great English-speaking peoples, diminished in number and weakened in moral force, should commit the crowning infamy of race-suicide, and so fail to fulfil that high destiny to which in the Providence of God they have been manifestly called.

The Committee, moved by these considerations, desire to recommend that wherever possible legislation should be promoted to secure—(*a*) The prohibition of so-called Neo-Malthusian appliances, and of patent drugs, and corrupting advertisements. (*b*) The prosecution of all who publicly and professionally assist preventive methods. (*c*) A proper and efficient standard and status of those who practise midwifery. (*d*) The national recognition of the dignity of motherhood, evinced by the provision of adequate care, protection, and assistance for women before and after childbirth.

(Signed) G. F. Bristol,
Chairman.

APPENDIX A.

Divorce and Prohibited Degrees.

An inquiry has been made as to the existence and nature of Canons of Churches respecting Divorce and Marriage within prohibited degrees. The following have been supplied to the Committee from authoritative sources:—

1. The Episcopal Church in Scotland (Canons as amended in 1890).

Canon 41.—*Of Holy Matrimony.*

1. No Clergyman of this Church shall solemnise Matrimony until he has been satisfied that the civil law of Scotland relating to the publication of intention to contract a regular marriage has been duly complied with.

2. No Clergyman shall perform the Marriage Service for persons who are within the prohibited degrees. (Appendix No. xxv.) [This refers to Abp. Parker's Table.]

3. Clergymen shall in all ordinary cases require marriages to be solemnised in church, and in the Solemnisation of Holy Matrimony they shall comply with the rubrical directions of the Book of Common Prayer so far as the circumstances of this Church will permit; but they may omit at their discretion a part of the prefatory and the concluding address.

[There is no reference in this Code to Divorce.]

2. The Church of Ireland.

Canon 11.

No clergyman shall solemnise marriages between parties who are within the degrees expressed in the Table already set forth, or in such as may be hereafter set forth by the authority of the Church.

[On April 28th, 1908, a Resolution from the House of Bishops was communicated to the General Synod of the Church of Ireland to the effect that the Clergy of the Church of Ireland were still bound by Canon 11, and therefore not at liberty to solemnise the marriage of a man with his deceased wife's sister.]

3. The Church in the United States of America.

Canon 38.

Section III.—No minister knowingly, after due inquiry, shall solemnise the marriage of any person who has been or is the husband or the wife of any other person then living from whom he or she has been divorced for any cause arising after marriage. But this Canon shall not be held to apply to the innocent party in a divorce for adultery; Provided, that before the application for such remarriage a period of not less than one year shall have elapsed after the granting of such divorce; and that satisfactory evidence touching the facts in the case, including a copy of the Court's decree and record, if practicable, with proof that the defendant was personally served or appeared in the action, be laid before the Ecclesiastical Authority, and such Ecclesiastical Authority, having taken legal advice thereon, shall have declared in writing that in his judgment the case of the applicant conforms to the requirements of the Canon; and Provided, further, that it shall be within the discretion of any minister to decline to solemnise any marriage.

Section IV.—If any minister of this Church shall have reasonable cause to doubt whether a person desirous of being admitted to Holy Baptism, or to Confirmation, or to the Holy Communion, has been married otherwise than as the Word of God and discipline

of this Church allow, such minister, before receiving such person to these ordinances, shall refer the case to the Bishop for his godly judgment thereupon; PROVIDED, however, that no minister shall in any case refuse these ordinances to a penitent person in imminent danger of death.

4. The Church of England in Canada.

Canon 3.—Forbidden Degrees.

1. The Table of Degrees prohibiting certain marriages set forth by authority in the year of our Lord 1563, and usually annexed to or included in the Book of Common Prayer, is hereby adopted by the General Synod.

2. No clergyman within the jurisdiction of the said Synod shall knowingly solemnise a marriage within the degrees prohibited by such Table.

Canon 5.—Marriage and Divorce.

No clergyman within the jurisdiction of the Church of England in Canada shall solemnise a marriage between persons either of whom shall have been divorced from one who is living at the time.

5. The Church of the Province of South Africa.

Canon 28.—Of Holy Matrimony.

1. No clergyman shall join in matrimony persons either of whom, not having been admitted as a catechumen, is an unbaptized person, or who are within the forbidden degrees as set forth in the Table of Kindred and Affinity annexed to the Book of Common Prayer.

2. The Synod hereby declares its adherence to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England concerning marriage and divorce.

Resolution XI. of the Provincial Synod of 1891.—*Church Discipline.*

This Synod resolves that no clergyman ought to admit to Holy Communion any person who has been united within the prohibited degrees, so long as the parties are living together as man and wife; or either of two persons so living together one of whom is either a person divorced from a former spouse on a ground other than that of adultery, or the guilty party in the case of

divorce on the ground of adultery, so long as the former spouse in either case is still living: PROVIDED, however, that nothing in this Resolution is to be construed as releasing any clergyman from acting on the directions contained in the third rubric preceding the Office of the Holy Communion.

Resolution passed by the Episcopal Synod.—Marriage with Deceased Wife's Sister.

1892. VI. In consequence of the recent act of the Legislature of the Cape Colony legalising marriage with a deceased wife's sister, the Bishops of the Province deem it necessary to remind the clergy and faithful laity that the law of Christ and His Church, as received by the Church of England and of this Province, must nevertheless be maintained in its integrity, and accordingly that no clergyman is justified in uniting together in holy matrimony persons so related, nor in admitting to Holy Communion persons so related who have been united in accordance with the civil law, so long as they live together as man and wife.

The Committee have received information from the West Indies, Australia, New Zealand, and Japan, but have not ascertained that those Churches have made Canons on the above-named subjects.

APPENDIX B.

RESTRICTION ON POPULATION.

1. *Fall in Birth-rate.*

The fall in the birth-rate in England and Wales is shown by noting that the birth-rate in 1876 was 36·3 per 1,000; in 1898 it was 29·4; and in the last quarter of 1904 it was 26·8.

In estimating the national loss arising from a lowered birth-rate, it is needful to remember that the death-rate has declined also; the lessening therefore of the birth-rate does not mean a corresponding loss of actual population, but it does probably mean a lessening of national power, for the decline in the death-rate means a larger proportion of old people than formerly; a dwindling death-rate means a lengthening of life, and a lengthening of life means a larger proportion of the aged. This may be exemplified by one single fact. In England and Wales in 1871 there were 1,063,923 persons between 60 and 70 years old; in 1901 there were 1,520,346, or nearly half as many again. With this we ought to compare the shortage of children. In 1881 there were 9,488,591 children under 15 years of age, or 36·5 of the whole population; in 1901 there were 10,545,744, or 32·3 of the popu-

lation. If the proportion of 1881 had been maintained there would have been 1,192,000 more children. Broadly speaking, the loss of young people is more than a million, the increase of old people is about half a million. Instead of the young we have the old.

It must, further, be remembered that emigration has declined; the number of emigrants in 1891–1901 was less than those in the previous decade by 500,000.

The loss of children in the American continent may be illustrated by the following figures. Under normal conditions the children under five years of age ought to be 12·70 per cent. of the population. The actual figures are as follows:—

	1880.	1890.
United States	13·4	11·9
	1871.	1901.
Canada	14·63	12·08
Australia and New Zealand, average...	16·10	11·61

The decline in Australia and New Zealand is greater than in any European country: the number of births per 1,000 women between 15 and 45 years of age fell 17·7 per cent. in England and Wales between 1880–2 and 1900–2, and in no European country was the fall as much as 20 per cent.; but the lowest fall in Australia and New Zealand was 23·2 per cent. and in New South Wales the fall was 30·6 per cent., while in the Australian Colonies and New Zealand it was 25·73 (New Zealand Official Year Book, p. 437). In New Zealand the number of children under 5 years was as follows:—

1906	11·47 per cent.
1901	11·15 ,,

In 1891 there were fewer children under 5 years by 3,624 than in 1886.

Thus there have recently been better returns. . . . On the other hand, the fertility is less, for the births per marriage are as follows:—

1887–1896	4·67 per cent.
1897–1906	3·38 ,,

The increase of population in Canada for three decades is:—

1871–1880	839,000
1881–1890	508,000
1891–1900	506,000

2. *Practice of Prevention.*

The effect of the practice may be judged from the following statement. Mr. Weston, in a paper read before the Statistical Society (September, 1902), calculated that in London alone the reduction in births due to restriction by artificial means amounted to 500 a week. The following figures appear to throw light on the question. In England and Wales the proportion of births to every 1,000 women of child-bearing age was as follows:—

1870–2	153·7
1900–2	114·8
1903	113·8

i.e. a decline of 25·31 per cent. in thirty years, which rose to 26 per cent. in 1903. The words quoted in the Report are those of M. Lunier.

3. *Physical Results.*

Dr. L. Bergeret ("Des Fraudes," &c.), who examined a large number of cases, including fibrous tumours, ovarian diseases, uterine cancer, &c., says that of the cases entrusted to him more than three-fourths coincided with practices of restriction, and most frequently they could justly be attributed to them. Drs. Richard and Devay are cited by him as agreeing generally in his conclusion. Professor Taylor, of Birmingham, declares himself "convinced, after many years of observation, that both sudden danger and chronic disease may be produced by the methods of prevention very generally employed." On the subject of injury to nerve power he is quite explicit: "None the less real and far more common is that chronic impairment of the nervous system which frequently follows the use of any preventive measures" (Presidential Address before British Gynæcological Society, 1904, pp. 12 and 13). He compares the effects to those of self-abuse. That neurasthenia follows self-abuse is admitted by Rohleder, Krafft-Ebing, Freud, and Gattel. See Dr. Havelock Ellis, "Studies in the Evolution of Sex," vol. ii., p. 213.

4. *Popular Mistakes.*

The opinion alluded to is that of Dr. Thos. Addis Emmet (formerly President of the American Gynæcological Society) in his work, "The Principles and Practice of Gynæcology," p. 24. Dr. L. Bergeret ("Des Fraudes," p. 21) says: "The mother who has borne eight or ten children will seem young by the side of the woman who has only sacrificed some years to the insane extravagances of luxury."

"The tenderness, &c., of parents," writes M. Leroy Beaulieu, "has the effect of depriving male children of any spirit of boldness and enterprise, and of any power of endurance. From this especially France is suffering in the present day."

5. *The Habit more General among the Well-to-do than among the Poor.*

De Beaumont, in his "Dépopulation de la France," states that the well-to-do classes who could bring up children under the best conditions have few children, and often even none. He quotes Diderot's saying, "Rien ne peuple comme les gueux: un enfant de plus n'est rien pour eux, la charité publique les nourrit." Professor Marshall, "Principles," &c., vol. i., p. 252, wrote: "In France for a long time, recently in America, and to a less extent in England, there has been a tendency for the abler and more intelligent part of the working-class population to avoid having large families; and this," he added, "is a source of great danger."

6. *The Probable Influence of the Habit on Divorce.*

In Civil Judicial Statistics of England and Wales (Part II) for 1906 (published April, 1908 and edited by Sir John Macdonell), on page 35, is a table from which the following is an extract:—

Out of all the divorces in the ten years ending 1906—

(1) 3,463 were of couples with *no* child, or 39·44 per cent.
(2) 2,104 were of couples with *only one* child, or 23·96 per cent.
(3) 1,407 were of couples with *only two* children, or 16·02 per cent.
(4) 1,616 were of couples with *two up to six* children, or 18·41 per cent.
(5) 178 were of couples with *over six* children, or 2·03 per cent.

It is to be noticed that nearly 40 per cent. of the divorces were of couples *without any children.*

It is a pity that the statistics are not graduated between two and six children. But it is evident that much fewer divorces take place than in the case of couples with two children, since couples with three, four, five, and six children only amount to 18·41 per cent. altogether.

The statistics show that 79·52, or nearly 80 per cent., of all the divorces take place between couples with two children and under.

Finally the statistics show that the statement that presence of children operates against divorce is abundantly verified.

No. 9.

Report of the Committee[1] *appointed to Consider and Report upon the Subject of the Moral Witness of the Church in Relation to*—(a) *The Democratic Ideal;* (b) *Social and Economic Questions.*

Eighty years ago De Tocqueville described Democracy as a great tidal-wave sweeping over Europe, and likened it in its overwhelming force and the certainty of its onward movement to one of those great geological changes which have taken place on the surface of the earth. Certainly there is no sign as yet of any ebb in that wave, but it is flowing more evidently in the direction of social reconstruction. The representative democracy of modern times that has arisen, with its new ideals and aspirations; the new prominence given to the wage-earners; the growing sense of dissatisfaction with things as they are; the claim, increasing in intensity, for justice in the distribution of the proceeds of industry—all these forces combine to bring the social problem to the front.

Further, this great problem is universal. It calls for solution in rural districts no less than in great centres of population. It belongs increasingly to every country.

It is the privilege of the Church to welcome this movement as one of the great developments of human history, which have behind them the authority of God. It follows that it is the mission of the Church to help to keep the spirit of democracy true to the divine purpose. Its aim, therefore, will be to assert a claim, and to recognise an obligation.

[1] Names of the Members of the Committee:—

Bishop of Bendigo.
" Birmingham.
" Bombay.
" Chicago.*
" Connecticut.
" Derry.
" Down.*
" Glasgow.*
" Hereford.*
" Islington.
" Kensington.
" Lichfield (*Chairman*).
" Michigan.*
" Michigan City.
Bishop of Newark.
" Newcastle, N.S.W.*
" North Dakota.
" North Queensland.
" Perth.
" Riverina.
" Sheffield.
" Southwell (*Secretary*).
" Stepney.
" Truro.
" Tuam.
Bishop Tugwell.
Bishop of Utah.

The Claim.—That the whole sphere of human life, material as well as spiritual, must be consecrated to the highest purpose; that every human aspiration, that every natural human desire, is meant to find its legitimate satisfaction, while all human wills and activities must be brought under the sway of Christian law.

The Obligation.—That is it the duty of the Church to apply the truths and principles of Christianity, especially the fundamental truths of the Fatherhood of God, and the Brotherhood of Man, to the solution of social and economic difficulties, to awaken and educate the social conscience, to further its expression in legislation (while preserving its own independence of political party), and to strive, above all, to present Christ before men as a Living Lord and King in the realm of common life.

An attitude of aloofness on the part of the Church, or timidity in facing its obligation, can only mean a serious failure in its work and a hindrance to its influence, and must tend to strengthen the feeling amongst the wage-earners that the Church is the ally of the comfortable rather than of the poor, and that it identifies itself with the interests of wealth and property; with the result that the people become indifferent to the Church, distrustful of its interest in their lives, and persuaded that it is out of sympathy with their hopes and aims.

The question inevitably arises, Why does the Church fail to win the sympathy and regard of those who seek an ideal so largely in accord with the Lord's own principles, since it is plainly wrong to suppose that this democratic movement is in itself atheistic, or anti-Christian?

The first answer, it must with shame be confessed, will be found in the fact that the new democracy in its search for brotherhood is confronted by the innumerable divisions of Christians and the ceaseless competitions of rival organisations, and finds that in our modern Church life there is little of the practical spirit of brotherhood, with the result that it not only holds aloof from the Church, but is also apt to leave organised religion wholly on one side.

Secondly, the actual system of Church government is too often autocratic, and this of necessity is alien to that desire and capacity for self-government which distinguishes the new democracy.

On the other hand, the new democracy, in spite of its ideal, has its horizon sadly limited. Material happiness is largely its aim, and, though its desire is brotherhood, it appeals too often to individual selfishness or to class interests. Moreover, it can hardly be denied that the movement is characterised by a quite inadequate perception of the need for the redemption of the individual man from the power of sin as a condition essential to social regeneration. It thus fails to value and to feel the need of that which the Church can supply—a spiritual vision, the opening out of the forces of redemption, contact with the Most Holy.

(1) First, then, the Church must make a fresh effort to show to the world the realisation of brotherhood in Christ. The principle of brotherhood was emphasised in the Report of the Committee on Industrial Problems, presented to the Lambeth Conference of 1897, and a suggestion was made that "wherever possible there should be formed, as a part of local Church organisation, Committees consisting chiefly of laymen whose work should be to study social and industrial problems from the Christian point of view, and to assist in creating and strengthening an enlightened public opinion in regard to such problems, and in promoting a more active spirit of social service as a part of Christian duty." [1] This suggestion has been very imperfectly acted upon. What is now needed is not only Diocesan Committees of Social Service, but smaller groups of Christian men and women in every place determined to make it their aim to bring the sense of justice and righteousness, which is common to Christianity and to democracy, to bear upon the matters of everyday life in trade, in society, and wherever their influence extends; who will give serious study to social problems and make the best of their opportunities of training in social service; who will then be qualified to take their place on public administrative bodies, both local and national; who will protest both by word and example, both in public and in private, against anything that is immoral or unjust; who will call into action any legislative machinery which already exists for the public welfare, and stir up public opinion on behalf of the removal of wrong wherever it may be found, thus making an earnest endeavour to share in the transforming work of Christianity "for their brethren and companions' sake."

In other words the Church must concentrate its resources on re-creating, inspiring, and using its own Demos, making of it a truly elect people, a laity (λαός), an instructed and disciplined "people of God." But this Church "laity" is to be raised up for service to the whole nation and to the world, and not for merely denominational interests; men of all classes of society united as comrades to fight the battle of the Lord against sin, the world, and the devil by virtue of their baptism.

This will lead on to a more general revelation of brotherhood in the Church itself, without which it is hopeless to expect to be able to win the confidence of the people.

On matters of public morality and social reform Christians of various denominations can and do co-operate, and it is therefore hoped that in this way also the common service of men will increasingly draw together those who are otherwise grievously divided.

(2) It is of the greatest importance that in the religious teaching of the Church a prominent place should be given to those practical principles of morality which are already recognised by the people

[1] See above, p. 268.

as true—*e.g.*, brotherhood, justice, including justice to other races than our own, honesty, purity, peaceableness, self-education, cleanliness, and care of health; and that there should be put plainly before the rich and leisured classses the sin of idleness, the responsibility of property, the paramount duty of public service, the incompatibility of selfish luxury with professing Christianity, and the duty of substituting justice and sympathy and brotherly effort for a condescending and thoughtless benevolence. At the same time it is important that all moral teaching, given in the name of Christ, should, like the teaching of the New Testament, be recognised as impartial in its bearing on the different classes of society.

(3) But a further, and in many ways more exacting, step must be taken by the Church. It should make more of the democratic principle which truly belongs to the system and tradition of the Church. It cannot be denied that at present in many quarters the administration of the Church is autocratic rather than democratic. This requires to be corrected. In teaching there must be more emphasis on brotherhood, and in practice less autocracy. Our representative institutions in the Church should everywhere be made realities. There should be less of the one-man rule. This means self-sacrifice on the part of the laity in the service of others; it means also that the parish priest will go among the people as the minister, as he that serveth, giving up all idea of exercising lordship over them.

(4) It is of the greatest importance, therefore, from this point of view that the Church of Christ, if it is to win the confidence of the democracy, should show its readiness to set its own house in order; to model its own system of government on a sound, representative, and democratic basis; to restore the ministry of the laity to its legitimate place and power in Church government and discipline; to exhibit such business capabilities in the administration of Church finance as shall at least provide adequate stipends and pensions for its clergy, reapportion and readjust where necessary existing resources for this purpose, furnish sufficient funds for the upkeep of Church fabrics and for the organisation of the charitable and philanthropic institutions of the Church; and, above all, to make impossible the abuses too often connected with Church patronage.

(5) And because the people deeply need what the Church alone can give, no sacrifice on the part of the Church is too great in giving it. For though the mass of wage-earners who form so large a part of the new democracy may have great strength of character due to a long struggle for existence, and wonderful depths of sympathy due to close and personal touch with sorrow and suffering, and though amongst them and their leaders are many

whose lives are inspired by the spirit of Christ, yet in the movement generally spiritual force is lacking. People need something more than material good. They need a Heavenly Vision. It is the mission of the Church to show men this Vision by preaching to them the ever-present Kingdom of God—a kingdom the notes of which, both here and hereafter, are "righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost."

(Signed) Augustus Lichfield,

Chairman.

APPENDIX.

The Committee desire to draw attention to the Report No. 412 [1] of the Convocation of Canterbury on the "Moral Witness of the Church on Economic Subjects," and reprints the following extract:—

"What is needed is that the Church should teach the individual his duty to his neighbour more completely, and with more reference to actual conditions. We have heard too much of the *rights* of property. We have heard enough of the *duties* of property towards the Church in its narrower sense. But we have heard too little (from the authorised Christian teacher) of the fundamental Christian principles in respect of 'getting' and 'spending.'

"The duty of the Christian as an individual may be considered in three ways: he may be regarded (1) as a worker, (2) as a capitalist and employer, and (3) as a consumer.

"(1) The Church should declare that the first duty of the Christian, whatever may be his circumstances, is that of work; for every man according to his ability must contribute by his service to the common well-being. Idleness, whether it is that of the rich or the poor man, is an offence against God and man. And by work we ought to mean the sincere application of all the man's faculties to his business 'in that state of life unto which it shall please God to call him.' The shirker and the trifler in any class of society are men who have failed to recognise the claim of God upon them.

"(2) The Church should teach that the Christian who is an owner of property must recognise that, whether he has inherited

[1] Sold at the National Society's Depository, Westminster; and by the S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, price 2*d.*

or acquired it, he holds it as a sacred trust. He has indeed, for good or evil, as society is now organised, legal authority, within certain limits, over the manner in which it is used; but before God his authority is that of a trustee for society, not of an absolute owner.

"And especially the owner of property as an employer must remember that he is responsible for the conditions under which his business is carried on. The Christian Church, which holds that the individual life is sacred, must teach that it is intolerable to it that any part of our industry should be organised upon the foundation of the misery and want of the labourer. The fundamental Christian principle of the remuneration of labour is that the first charge upon any industry must be the proper maintenance of the labourer—an idea which it has been sought to express in popular language by the phrase 'the living wage.'

"The Church should also urge upon its members the moral, as distinct from the legal, obligation of providing and making efficient whatever in the way of apparatus or arrangements is necessary to safeguard the life and health of the worker.

"(3) The Church should teach the moral responsibility of the consumer; that is, that no Christian has the right to demand commodities at a price which he knows, or can ascertain, to be incompatible with the adequate remuneration of the workers and proper conditions of industry; or, again, by deferring payment, to render it more difficult to secure these objects.

"But in carrying out such ideas of a man's duty the individual by himself is no doubt hampered in a thousand ways. The single employer or capitalist is often almost as powerless to alter the system of which he is a part as is a labourer. When 'the system' makes it necessary for him to do what his conscience condemns, he can of course, with whatever difficulty, refuse to do it, and suffer the financial loss or ruin involved. We have almost dropped out of our current Christian teaching the idea that a Christian may be called upon to make any great financial or other sacrifice for conscience' sake. But it is doubtful whether any more effective instrument of reform in our industrial or financial system could be found than the multiplication of such protests of the individual conscience against wrong, which at present are made but rarely. We believe that nothing would so effectually stir the common conscience as such examples of splendid renunciation.

"IV. *The Duty of the Christian as Citizen.*—But undoubtedly, as we have said, the individual by his private action is able to do little to alter what is amiss. The law must help—that is the expressed will and power of the whole community—and all serious students of society are at the present time ready to recognise this. Hardly anyone could be found to advocate a return to the *laisser*

faire policy of the days preceding the Factory Acts. Here, then, we touch a new department of duty. The individual Christian is also a citizen. As a citizen he must inform himself on economic matters and take his share in public service."

*** For books of reference see the lists published by the Christian Social Union and by the Social Service Union of the Presbyterian Church of England.

No. 10.

Report of the Committee[1] *appointed to Consider and Report upon the Subject of Organisation within the Anglican Communion*—(a) *A Central Consultative Body;* (b) *A Tribunal of Reference;* (c) *The Relations of Primates and Metropolitans in the Colonies and Elsewhere to the See of Canterbury;* (d) *The Limitations of the Authority of a Diocesan Bishop.*

The remarkable expansion of the Anglican Communion during the latter half of the nineteenth century has been accompanied by an equally remarkable development of provincial organisation. In addition to the ancient jurisdictions of Canterbury, York, Armagh, and Dublin, there are now new provinces, with varying forms of

[1] Names of the Members of the Committee :—

Bishop of Albany.
" Barbados.
Bishop Baynes.
Bishop of Brechin (Primus).
Archbishop of Brisbane.
Bishop of Bristol.
" Croydon.
" Dorking.
" Down.
" Exeter (*Chairman*).
" Gibraltar.
" Gloucester.*
" Grafton and Armidale.
" Ipswich.
" Los Angeles.*
Archbishop of Melbourne.*
Bishop of Montreal.
" Moray and Ross.
" Natal
Bishop of North Queensland (*Secretary*).
Bishop of Oregon.
" Ottawa.
" Qu'Appelle.
" St. Asaph.*
" Salisbury.
" Southampton.
Archbishop of Sydney.
Bishop of Texas.
Archbishop of Toronto.
Bishop of Wellington.
Archbishop of the West Indies.

organisation and jurisdiction, centred around the metropolitical sees of Calcutta, Toronto, Cape Town, Rupertsland, Sydney, Melbourne, and Brisbane, or having as metropolitans, for the time being, the Bishops of Dunedin and Jamaica. The Episcopal Church in Scotland is organised with a Primus; and the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America with a Presiding Bishop. The Church of Japan is also organised as a national church. Not only have such new provinces been formed, but, in the case of Canada, two Provincial Synods and four independent Dioceses have been subordinated to a General Synod of the whole Dominion; while in Australia, where the General Synod preceded provincial organisation, three provinces have been formed, with the near prospect of a fourth being added to their number.

This twofold process of expansion and consolidation in the Anglican Communion points to the necessity for a central consultative body for supplying information and advice. Such a body, to quote the Encyclical letter issued by the Bishops attending the fourth Lambeth Conference in July, 1897, "must win its way to general recognition by the services which it may be able to render to the working of the Church. It can have no other than a moral authority which will be developed out of its action." The same Conference of 1897 formally adopted the following Resolution (No. 5): "It is advisable that a consultative body should be formed to which resort may be had, if desired, by the National Churches, Provinces, and extra Provincial Dioceses of the Anglican Communion either for information or for advice, and that the Archbishop of Canterbury be requested to take such steps as he may think most desirable for the creation of this consultative body." [1]

Acting upon the above Resolution, on July 30th, 1898, the Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Temple), in a letter to the Bishops of the Anglican Communion, made the following suggestions:—

I. That the Consultative Committee should sit every year at Lambeth in the week after the second Sunday in July, and should consist of: (1) the Archbishop of Canterbury; (2) the Archbishop of York; (3) the Bishop of London; (4) the Bishop of Durham; (5) the Bishop of Winchester; (6) the Archbishop of Armagh; (7) the Primus of Scotland; and of Bishops appointed, one by each, by those of the following churches and separate Dioceses which may think fit to make such appointment: (8) India and Ceylon; (9) Cape Colony; (10) West Indies; (11) Canada; (12) Australia and New Zealand; (13) China and Japan; (14) the Independent Dioceses; (15 and 16) and two by the Church in the United States.

II. (*a*) The mode of appointing these representative Bishops is

[1] See above, pp. 187 and 199.

left to the churches that appoint. A representative Bishop may be appointed for one year or for any number of years, and need not be a member of the body which appoints him.

(*b*) For the purpose of electing the Bishop who is to represent the body of independent Bishops, each of those Bishops is at liberty to nominate a Bishop to the Archbishop of Canterbury before the end of January. The list of Bishops so nominated will then be sent to all the independent Bishops, and each of them will, if he thinks fit to vote, send to the Archbishop the name of the one in that list for whom he votes. The largest number of votes will carry the election.

III. Notice should be sent before the end of April of any Bishop appointed by any one of the churches above named.

IV. All matters to be submitted to this consultative body should be sent to the Archbishop of Canterbury before Easter Day.

The Central Consultative Committee subsequently was formed upon the basis of these suggestions. It met for the first time in July, 1901, and has already proved its utility by considering and advising on important questions.

I.

Your Committee feel, however, that the time has come when greater effect can be given to Resolution 5 formally adopted by the Conference of 1897, and quoted above. They recommend, therefore, that the present Central Consultative Committee be reconstructed upon the following representative basis :—

1. The Archbishop of Canterbury shall be a member *ex officio*.

2. The other members shall be elected or nominated upon the following basis of representation: Province of Canterbury 2, Province of York 1, the Church of Ireland 1, the Episcopal Church in Scotland 1, the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America 4, the Church of England in Canada 1, the Church of England in the Dioceses of Australia and Tasmania 1, the Church of the Province of New Zealand 1, the Province of the West Indies 1, the Church of the Province of South Africa 1, the Province of India and Ceylon 1, the Dioceses of China and Corea and the Church of Japan 1, Missionary and other extra-provincial Bishops under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Canterbury 1. Total 17.

3. The above list shall be subject to revision at successive Lambeth Conferences.

4. (*a*) The mode of appointing these representative Bishops shall be left to the churches that appoint. A representative Bishop may be appointed for one year or for any number of years, and need

not be a member of the body which appoints him, but each member shall retain office until his successor has been notified to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

(*b*) For the purpose of electing the Bishop who is to represent the body of independent Bishops, each of those Bishops shall be at liberty to nominate a Bishop to the Archbishop of Canterbury before the end of January. The list of Bishops so nominated will then be sent to all the independent Bishops, and each of them will, if he thinks fit to vote, send to the Archbishop the name of the one in that list for whom he votes. The largest number of votes shall carry the election.

5. The Central Consultative Committee shall meet at least once a year, and may be specially convened or otherwise consulted in order to deal with any difficulty that may have been presented to them.

6. The Central Consultative Committee shall be prepared to receive consultative communications from any Bishop, but in considering such communications shall carefully regard any limitations upon such references which may be imposed by provincial regulation.

II.

The Lambeth Conference of 1897, having due regard to the character of the whole Anglican Communion, stopped short of the formation of a Tribunal of Reference. From this position your Committee cannot recommend any material advance. To be effective, the jurisdiction of what may be regarded as a final court of appeal for the Anglican Communion would need to be accepted by all parts of the Communion. The exceptional position of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America precludes any approach to a foreign court. And certain other churches by their present constitution exclude any appeal in ecclesiastical matters to a court outside their own bodies. On the other hand, the Church of the Province of South Africa, acting on their own initiative, have constituted the Central Consultative Committee their ultimate court of appeal in matters connected with "faith or doctrine." In view of these facts your Committee do not advise the formation of a tribunal of reference, but neither do they desire to place an obstacle in the way of any Provinces or Churches which may wish to find outside themselves a court for the final decision of disputes.

III.

In accordance with the spirit of the foregoing portion of this Report, your Committee record their conviction that no supremacy of the See of Canterbury over Primatial or Metropolitan Sees outside England is either practicable or desirable. In stating this

your Committee do not forget the peculiar circumstances which determine the relation of the Metropolitan See of India to the See of Canterbury. The Committee further bear witness to the universal recognition in the Anglican Communion of the ancient precedence of the See of Canterbury. In this connection also they desire to draw attention to Resolutions 9 and 10 of the Lambeth Conference of 1897, which run as follow :—

(9) Where it is intended that any Bishop-elect not under the Metropolitan jurisdiction of the See of Canterbury should be consecrated in England under the Queen's Mandate, it is desirable, if it be possible, that he should not be expected to take an oath of personal obedience to the Archbishop of Canterbury, but rather should before his Consecration make a solemn declaration that he will pay all due honour and deference to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and will respect and maintain the spiritual rights and privileges of the Church of England, and of all churches in communion with her. In this manner the interests of unity would be maintained without any infringement of the local liberties or jurisdiction.

(10) If such Bishop-elect be designated to a See within any Primatial or Provincial Jurisdiction it is desirable that he should at his consecration take the customary Oath of Canonical Obedience to his own Primate or Metropolitan.[1]

In the spirit of these Resolutions, your Committee desire to assert the general principle of the autonomy of national churches within the Anglican Communion, believing that national churches will give their best contribution to the life of the Church Universal if allowed to grow up freely in their own soil, and to develop under local conditions.

IV.

With reference to the limitations of authority of Diocesan Bishops, your Committee desire to affirm that the authority of the Diocesan Bishop as the Minister of the Church is not absolute but constitutional, being limited on the one hand by the Canons applicable to Province and Diocese, and on the other hand by the analogy of the ancient principle that he should act after taking counsel with his clergy and his people.

In conclusion, your Committee recommend that the substance of the foregoing Report find expression in the Encyclical letter of the Conference,[2] and submit resolutions in accordance with their Report.

(Signed) A. Exon :
Chairman.

[1] See above p. 200.

[2] See above p. 312.

No. 11.

Report of the Committee[1] *appointed to Consider and Report upon the Subject of Reunion and Intercommunion*—(a) *Episcopal Churches;* (b) *Non-Episcopal Churches;* (c) *Report of the Committee on the* Unitas Fratrum.

PREAMBLE.

I. The Orthodox Eastern Church.
II. The Separate Churches of the East.
III. The Latin Communion.
IV. Separate Churches of the West.
V. The "Unitas Fratrum."
VI. The Scandinavian Churches.
VII. Presbyterian and other Non-Episcopal Churches.
Appendix of Extracts on the Presbyterian Doctrine of Ordination.

Your Committee appointed to consider and report upon the subject of Reunion and Intercommunion with Episcopal and Non-episcopal Churches and to review the report of a Committee appointed to consider the position of the *Unitas Fratrum*, have approached their important task as follows:—

They have divided themselves into groups dealing with the different aspects of the subject submitted to their consideration. They have also referred certain special questions to another group selected from their whole membership.

The Report and Resolutions which they now have the honour to present are based upon material furnished by the groups severally, but they represent the judgment of the Committee as a whole.

At the head of their Report they desire to affirm once again

[1] Names of the Members of the Committee:—

Bishop (R. Ellis) of Aberdeen.
Bishop (W. C. Doane) of Albany.
Bishop (M. R. Neligan) of Auckland.
Bishop (G. W. Kennion) of Bath and Wells.
Bishop (C. Gore) of Birmingham.
Bishop (E. J. Palmer) of Bombay.
Bishop (W. J. F. Robberds) of Brechin (Primus).
Archbishop (St. C. G. A. Donaldson) of Brisbane.
Bishop (F. Goldsmith) of Bunbury.
Bishop (E. Talbot) of Central Pennsylvania.
Bishop (C. P. Anderson) of Chicago.
Bishop (C. S. Olmsted) of Colorado.
Bishop (J. B. Crozier) of Down and Connor (*Secretary*).

the principle asserted by the Conference of 1897 (Res. 34), that "the Divine purpose of visible unity among Christians" is "a fact of revelation." [1] Your Committee draw from this principle the inference that in all partial projects of reunion and intercommunion the final attainment of the Divine purpose should be kept in view as our object; and that care should be taken to do what will advance the reunion of the whole of Christendom, and to abstain from doing anything that will retard or prevent it. They have thought it right to propose a resolution to the Conference on this point.[2] They recognise with thankfulness the manifold signs of an increasing desire for unity among all Christian bodies, and with a deepened sense of the call to co-operate with the manifest leading of the Divine Spirit they venture to request the Conference to renew the Resolution carried in 1897 (Res. 35),[3] urging the duty of special intercession for the unity of the Church in accordance with our Lord's own prayer.

Your Committee do not, however, forget that we shall best enter into the Divine purpose by considering what sort of projects

Bishop (H. C. G. Moule) of Durham.
Bishop (A. Robertson) of Exeter.
Bishop (J. A. Richardson) of Fredericton (*Secretary*).
Bishop (W. E. Collins) of Gibraltar.
Bishop (A. E. Campbell) of Glasgow.
Bishop (H. E. Cooper) of Grafton and Armidale.
Bishop (L. H. Roots) of Hankow.
Bishop (D. Williams) of Huron.
Bishop (J. M. Francis) of Indianapolis.
Bishop Coadjutor (A. E. Joscelyne) of Jamaica.
Bishop (G. F. P. Blyth) in Jerusalem.
Bishop (G. A. Lefroy) of Lahore.
Bishop (E. King) of Lincoln.
Bishop (J. H. Johnson) of Los Angeles.
Bishop (G. L. King) of Madagascar.
Bishop (G. M. Williams) of Marquette.
Archbishop (H. L. Clarke) of Melbourne.
Bishop (J. Carmichael) of Montreal.
Bishop (A. J. Maclean) of Moray and Ross.
Bishop (C. O. Mules) of Nelson.
Bishop (N. D. J. Straton) of Newcastle.
Bishop (D. H. Greer) of New York.
Bishop Coadjutor (E. M. Parker) of New Hampshire.
Bishop (C. P. Scott) of North China.
Bishop (C. F. D'Arcy) of Ossory.
Bishop (C. Hamilton) of Ottawa.
Bishop (C. O. L. Riley) of Perth.
Bishop (C. Whitehead) of Pittsburgh.
Archbishop (S. B. Matheson) of Rupertsland.
Bishop (A. G. Edwards) of St. Asaph.
Bishop (J. W. Williams) of St. John's, Kaffraria.
Bishop (J. Wordsworth) of Salisbury (*Chairman*).
Bishop (L. L. Kinsolving) of Southern Brazil.
Bishop (W. C. Gray) of Southern Florida.
Bishop (E. S. Talbot) of Southwark.
Bishop (C. G. Lang) of Stepney (*Secretary*).
Bishop (T. F. Gailor) of Tennessee.
Bishop (C. H. Gill) of Travancore.
Bishop (A. C. A. Hall) of Vermont.
Bishop (T. H. Armstrong) of Wangaratta.
Bishop (W. W. Cassels) of Western China.
Archbishop (E. Nuttall) of the West Indies.
Bishop T. E. Wilkinson.*
Bishop (H. E. Ryle) of Winchester.

[1] See above p. 205.
[2] See above p. 205.
[3] See Resolution 58, p. 331.

are opportune, and what should be deferred. They perceive that the final result may often be hindered by premature advances in one direction, and hastened by mature advances in another. In particular they believe that the most pressing need of the present day is advance in the direction of what is usually in England called Home Reunion. They are of opinion that success in this effort, if animated by spiritual motives and conducted upon Catholic lines, would be the most persuasive evidence of the working of the Holy Spirit of unity amongst us, and would be a most powerful instrument for promoting advances in quite different directions, and not in any way a hindrance to them. Next to this they believe that development of friendly relations already existing with the orthodox and separate Churches of the East, with the Old Catholics, with the Churches of Scandinavia, especially that of Sweden, and with the *Unitas Fratrum*, will be most fruitful of results, and they have prepared resolutions in respect to all of these bodies.[1] The Committee are not unmindful of the fact that there can be no fulfilment of the Divine purpose in any scheme of reunion which does not ultimately include the great Latin Church of the West, with which our history has been so closely associated in the past, and to which we are still bound by many ties of common faith and tradition. But they realise that any advance in this direction is at present barred by difficulties which we have not ourselves created, and which we cannot of ourselves remove.

I.

The Orthodox Eastern Church.

As regards our relations with the Churches of the Orthodox East, your Committee record with thankfulness the fact that there has been a steady growth of friendly intercourse between the two Communions during the period which has passed since the last Lambeth Conference. It will be enough to mention, in illustration of this fact, the healthy mediating influence of the Anglican bishopric at Jerusalem, the sending of students from the Orthodox East to the University of Oxford and of an English student to the Theological College of the Church of Constantinople in the island of Halki, the increasing number of voluntary societies in England and America which are working for the furtherance of intercommunion with the East, the many friendly visits which have been paid by English and American bishops to dignitaries of the Greek and Russian Churches, and the unvarying courtesy and goodwill with which they have been received; above all, the frequent occasions on which the clergy of our Churches in many lands have been able to minister to Orthodox Easterns in cases of

[1] See above p. 334.

emergency, and conversely. Whilst they have no desire to over-estimate the effect or the immediate value of things such as these, they are confident that such interchange of friendly offices cannot but have a real effect as time goes on.

Your Committee are of opinion that efforts after unity are in no sense furthered by a whittling away of our distinctive position, and hold that whilst we should always be ready to answer the questions of others as to our own position, we are bound to seek a like satisfaction at their hands. Nevertheless, they would lay stress upon the futility of putting definite questions on crucial points of ecclesiastical order to individual dignitaries of the Eastern Churches, which they can only answer in accordance with their existing canons. They are strongly of opinion that the more satisfactory way is to seize every opportunity of mutual service, in the sure conviction that obstacles which now appear insurmountable may in course of time be found to vanish away. The doubts which have been expressed in the Greek Churches with regard to Baptism as ministered by us have already been laid to rest in the sister Church of Russia, where the question has been investigated and dealt with in the light of acknowledged facts. We venture to hope that the use which is already being made, in exceptional circumstances, of the services of our Ministry may increase and spread until it shall lead to the diffusion of a more accurate knowledge, and so put an end to the last remaining doubts on their part on the subject of the validity of our Orders.

Your Committee would call attention to Resolution 36 of the Lambeth Conference of 1897, which ran as follows:—

> "That the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the Bishop of London be requested to act as a Committee, with power to add to their number, to confer personally or by correspondence with the Orthodox Eastern Patriarchs, the 'Holy Governing Synod' of the Church of Russia, and the chief authorities of the various Eastern Churches, with a view to consider the possibility of securing a clearer understanding and of closer relations between the Churches of the East and the Anglican Communion." . . .[1]

They are of opinion that a Committee of this character should be constituted and made permanent, and that it might well take cognisance of all that concerns our relations with the Churches of the Orthodox East. Further, they would lay stress on the fact that all communications which concern the whole Orthodox Eastern Communion, in order to be effective, must be made to the authorities of that Communion conjointly, and not to individuals only.

With a view to a fuller and more effective comity between

[1] See p. 205.

them and us, your Committee are of opinion that it should be the recognised practice of the Churches of our Communion

(1) at all times to baptize the children of members of any Church of the Orthodox Eastern Communion in cases of emergency, provided that there is a clear understanding that such baptism is under no circumstances to be repeated;

(2) at all times to admit properly qualified communicant members of any Church of the Orthodox Eastern Communion to communicate in our Churches when they are deprived of the ministrations of a priest of their own Communion.

Your Committee are also of opinion that in cases where there are large numbers of Orthodox Easterns dwelling amongst our people and without spiritual ministrations of their own, as in many parts of Canada and of the United States of America, the Bishops more especially concerned might be advised to communicate with the Patriarchs or Governing Bodies of the Churches concerned, informing them of the facts and saying that, in the event of a priest (or priests) being sent to minister to such Orthodox Easterns, both the Bishop and his clergy would be glad to extend to him (or them) all possible help and sympathy.

Further, in view of the fact that a National Council of the Russian Church is about to assemble, for the first time for over two hundred years, your Committee are of opinion that it is desirable that a letter of greeting should be sent from the Lambeth Conference to this Council, and that the letter should be conveyed to the Council by two or three Bishops if possible; and that His Grace the President should be requested to cause such a letter to be written and to sign it on behalf of the Conference, and to nominate Bishops to convey it to the Council.

II.

The Separate Churches of the East.

Your Committee have taken into consideration the condition of the ancient separate Churches of the East, and desire to reaffirm their conviction that our position in the East involves real obligations in regard to the Churches which, whatever their shortcomings, have at least stood alone in the maintenance of our Holy Faith in many lands; and this under much obloquy and amid many persecutions. Nor, in spite of the fact that they have all rested under the imputation of heresy at one time or another, can they simply be thrown aside together on this ground. The Armenian Church, now scattered far and wide with the ancient nation of whose history it is the most striking and significant part,

declares with justice that its absence from the Council of Chalcedon was due to political reasons more than anything else, and has always strenuously denied, and apparently with no little reason, the charges of Aphthartodocetic heresy which have been levelled against it. The doctrinal position of the little East Syrian Church which was once implicated in Nestorianism seems to call for fresh consideration in our day; whilst modern investigations necessitate a re-examination of the relation in which Nestorius himself stood to the heresy which bears his name. It has been contended that the Monophysite heresy has no longer any real hold amongst the Syrian Jacobites, and that it is even less vigorous in the Coptic Church. Similar statements have been made with regard to the Syrian Churches in Southern India. How far these estimates are true is of course matter for careful study: in themselves they are undoubtedly probable, for it is the nature of heresy to die away, even as it is the nature of the Faith to grow and spread. But at least it is clear that the matter calls for investigation, and that these struggling Christian Churches, each and all of which have often turned towards us for help, have a real claim upon our love and our sympathy.

In view of these facts, your Committee are of opinion that steps should be taken to ascertain the doctrinal position of the separate Churches of the East, with a view to possible intercommunion; and that this could best be done by the appointment of commissions to examine the doctrinal position of each of them, and, for example, to suggest some carefully and sympathetically framed statement of the Faith as to our Lord's Person, in the simplest possible terms, which might be submitted to the particular Church, when feasible, in order to ascertain whether it represented the belief of that Church with substantial accuracy. And they are of opinion that, in the event of such doctrinal agreement being obtained, it would be right (1) for any Church of the Anglican Communion to admit individual communicant members of those Churches to communicate with us when they are deprived of this means of grace through isolation, and conversely, for our communicants to seek the same privileges in similar circumstances; and (2) for the Churches of the Anglican Communion to permit our communicants to communicate on special occasions with these Churches, even when not deprived of this means of grace through isolation, and conversely, that their communicants should be allowed the same privileges in similar circumstances. Further than this, however, your Committee do not think it would be right to go, without taking into account the effect which such action might have upon our relations with other Churches.

III.

The Latin Communion.

Turning now to the Latin Communion, your Committee record with deep interest certain more or less marked changes in the relation between the Latin Church and the Christian world in general. (1) They notice the freer entrance of Roman Catholic theologians into the general field of modern scholarship, and they cannot but believe that a commonwealth of learning is a great help towards union; (2) they notice the tendency of many who are not of the Roman Catholic Communion, or, indeed, in many cases, members of any episcopal Church, to look with sympathetic hope towards that great Communion as embodying ideals which they find to be largely lacking in much of the sectional Christianity of to-day, and this all the more when they see a new spirit of intellectual liberty and ecclesiastical and social reform stirring within its borders; (3) at the same time they perceive in the current literature of the Roman Catholic Church a growing interest in the practical concerns of other Churches, and not least of our own, which is sometimes accompanied with a sense of deficiencies in the Latin Church itself for which a remedy will have to be sought outside.

These indications brighten the outlook for the future, but for the present your Committee can only repeat the opinion which has been expressed with deep regret in two former Conferences, viz., that under present circumstances it is useless to consider the question of possible intercommunion with our brethren of that Communion in view of the fact that no such proposal would be entertained but on conditions which it would be impossible for us to accept. Nevertheless they desire to place upon record their conviction that no projects of union can ever be regarded as satisfactory which deliberately leave out the Churches of the Latin Communion; and nowhere more than here would they urge the importance of the cultivation of relations of friendly courtesy on the part of our representatives abroad towards the ecclesiastical authorities in the countries where they live, and the desirability that all chaplains chosen for service on the continent of Europe and elsewhere should be instructed to show this courtesy.

At the same time your Committee feel it necessary to sound a note of warning in a matter which closely concerns our people abroad and at home, that of mixed marriages. Of the newest Roman Catholic regulations on the subject, according to which no marriage, and therefore no mixed marriage, is recognised as valid unless it has been contracted in the presence of the Roman Catholic parish priest or his representative, nor any betrothal as valid unless it has been entered into in the presence of a priest or of two witnesses, your Committee need not here speak further than to

say that such regulations constitute a fruitful means of intimidation or evasion on the part of unconscientious persons, and may easily lead to grievous moral disorders in the case of the ignorant. Further, your Committee earnestly deplore any celebration of a marriage which is not either accompanied or immediately followed by prayer and the invocation of the divine sanction and blessing, and they would urge that our people should be warned that, in the case of a mixed marriage with a Roman Catholic, not only does the canon law of that Communion provide that it shall be thus celebrated, but there is commonly exacted a promise that the children of the marriage shall be brought up as Roman Catholics—that is to say, in a religious system which the Anglican parent cannot conscientiously accept.

IV.

Separate Churches of the West.

Your Committee desire to repeat the expressions of hearty goodwill and fraternal sympathy which have been made by former Conferences towards the ancient Church of Holland and the Old Catholics of Germany, Switzerland, and Austria. They have watched with much satisfaction and thankfulness the progress of these latter bodies, which have for some time invited us to holy Communion, and to which the Churches of our communion have formally extended the same privileges by resolutions of two Lambeth Conferences. They would like to see a similar relation of fellowship ratified between ourselves and the ancient Church of Holland. At the same time they cannot but deprecate very earnestly the setting up of new organised bodies of Christians in regions in America, England, or elsewhere, where a Church with apostolic ministry and Catholic doctrine offers all religious privileges without the imposition of uncatholic terms of communion, more especially in cases where no difference of language or nationality exists.

With regard to the Spanish Reformed Church and the Lusitanian Church, towards which previous Conferences have expressed their sympathy, both of which look to Bishops of the Irish Church for counsel and support, your Committee desire to say that they welcome the successful efforts which have been made by each of these bodies to bring its liturgy into closer accord with Catholic standards.

V.

The "Unitas Fratrum."

This subject comes before the Conference as one previously discussed in 1878 and 1888,[1] when the matter was left in suspense,

[1] See above pp. 95, 123, 166.

and more recently in a detailed statement on the part of the *Unitas* (1904) regarding their succession and other questions, a statement framed expressly as an appeal to attention on the part of our Communion.

In 1906 the Archbishop of Canterbury appointed a Committee of Anglican Divines to review the problem. In their recent learned Report laid before the present Conference they find the claimed episcopal succession not proven.

On the other hand, the claim of the *Unitas* to respectful and sympathetic consideration is in many ways unique, in view not only of its reverence for Episcopacy, and of its cordial attitude towards our Communion, but of its noble record of missionary service.

The present moment is timely for the consideration of the question, as the annual Synod of the British province of the *Unitas* meets next month (August 4th, 1908), and the decennial General Synod meets at Herrnhut next year, 1909.

Members of your Committee have had the opportunity of meeting Bishop Hassé, President of the Directing Board of the Moravian Church in Great Britain, who was present by invitation; and a free interchange of inquiry and answer took place.

Though personally challenging the conclusions of the Committee of Divines, the Bishop frankly accepted the position created by it for our side. His impressions as to the attitude of his Church as a whole towards closer relations with us were decidedly favourable.

As a result of this interview and of subsequent discussions, four Resolutions are proposed by your Committee for acceptance by the Conference.[1]

VI.

The Scandinavian Churches.

The Churches of Sweden, Denmark, and Norway are Churches of maritime and adventurous peoples which have much affinity with our own people. They have been brought into intimate contact with the natives of the British Isles at many periods of history, and they have contributed largely to the formation of our race. They have recently become bound by fresh ties to the British Empire, and they are sending forth emigrants into many parts of the United States of America and other countries of the world in which they come in contact with the Church life of our communion. In their own homes these peoples have National Churches in close alliance with the State, which, though in different degrees, have preserved more of a continuity with the past than other Protestant and Reformed Churches on the continent of Europe.

[1] See above p. 334.

Your Committee believe that it will be best in the first instance to refer to our relations with the Church of Sweden. They rejoice to observe that the Resolutions of our previous Conferences (Res. 14 of 1888 and Res. 39 of 1897) [1] have been followed by the official mission of the Rt. Rev. H. W. Tottie, D.D., Bishop of Kalmar, who is the bearer of a Latin letter to our President from the Archbishop of Upsala, dated June 20th, 1908, in which the following sentence occurs: "Lætamur quod Vos, Episcopi Anglicani, jam pridem spectatis, ut Ecclesiam vestram et nostram inter se societate quadam devinciatis. Id quibus in rebus et quo modo fieri possit, deliberetis, velim, cum Henry William Tottie, episcopo Calmariensi, collega meo carissimo, qui, Vobis benigne permittentibus atque jussu Regis nostri clementissimi, ad concilium quod mox habebitis, venturus est," which we may render: "We rejoice that you Anglican Bishops have for some time had in view the binding together of your Church and ours in some sort of alliance. I would ask that you should deliberate as to the points and the method of such an alliance with Henry William Tottie, Bishop of Kalmar, my beloved colleague, who, with your kind permission and under the orders of our most gracious King, is about to come to the Council which you are soon to hold."

Your Committee have taken full advantage of the presence of this honourable and learned envoy of the Swedish Church, and desire to thank him for the courtesy, kindness, and patience with which he has discharged his task towards themselves. They would suggest that before the Conference dissolves he should be invited to deliver this letter in person, and to receive the answer which is contained in the Resolution they have drafted.[2]

The Bishop of Kalmar produced further evidence in support of what may now, perhaps, be described as the received opinion, that the actual succession of the Swedish Episcopate is unbroken. It appears from documents, to which he has drawn our attention, that importance was attached to the historic Episcopate at different periods in the history of the Church of Sweden.[3] He has translated the various forms of consecration and ordination used in it at different times, distinguishing them from the forms of admission to a benefice, with a view to showing that they have been from the first sufficient. With regard to the Form for the Episcopate,

[1] See above pp. 122, 206.

[2] See above p. 335.

[3] The Bishop of Kalmar refers to the "Kyrko-Ordning" of 1571, which contains the ritual of the consecration of Bishops and of the Ordering of Priests. On p. lxxxv. of this book it is said, regarding the commission of a Bishop to ordain Priests: "This practice was very useful, and undoubtedly has proceeded from God the Holy Ghost." In the "Church Law" of 1686 (chapter xix. sec. 6), which is a book of present authority, it is said that whosoever should venture to minister as a Priest, and is not regularly called or ordained according to the rite there set forth, shall be punished by the Consistorial Court. At present an offence of this kind would be tried, under modern legislation, in a civil court.

the evidence which has been produced is such as to command very serious attention.[1] As regards the transmission of the presbyterate, the use in the ordination of presbyters of the term *Prediko-ämbetet* (ministerium), which appears to have been introduced into the form in 1686, is open to very grave objection; but the term *Prest-ämbetet* (priestly office), which was used in previous ordinals, has been restored since the year 1894. The Bishop of Kalmar has also translated for the use of those members of your Committee who have dealt with this subject the *Ritual of the Holy Supper* and the *Order of Confirmation*, and has called their attention to the fact that the three Creeds are accepted as standards by the Church of Sweden, though only the Apostles' Creed is used in public worship.

In view of all this, your Committee are of opinion that the question of the spiritual validity of the Holy Orders of the Church of Sweden is undoubtedly matter for friendly conference and explanation, and that certain lesser points should also be considered, *e.g.*, as to the form in which the Diaconate is retained, and as to the rite and minister of Confirmation.

It is also very desirable, from an administrative point of view, that there should be some regular episcopal oversight over the

[1] The form used in the consecration of a Bishop is to be found in the service entitled "How a Bishop shall be constituted (inställas) in Office" (chap. xii. of the "Handbok" of 1894). In the course of this service certain important texts of Scripture are read to the Bishop "who is to be consecrated" (som skall invigas). The Archbishop says: "The Lord grant unto thee grace to keep faithfully these words in thy heart! May they abide a rule for thy life . . . so as to sanctify thee for the care of that See which has been committed to thy trust. Of thee does the Church of God expect that thou shouldest consider the weightiness of the office of a Bishop," etc. Then, after a confession of faith, made in the form of the Apostles' Creed, follows examination as to willingness to undertake the office of a Bishop, carefulness therein and as to the preaching of God's Word and the administration of the Holy Sacraments, and care for the congregation (*i.e.*, Church). Then follows the important formula: "God Almighty strengthen and help thee to keep these promises! And according to the authority which on God's behalf is entrusted to me by His congregation (*i.e.*, Church) for this purpose, I hereby commit to thee the office of a Bishop in N. N. diocese, in the name of God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost." Then the Bishop falls on his knees, and hymn 132 of the "Psalmbok" ("O thou Holy Ghost, come within us") is sung, during which the Archbishop delivers to him the King's Mandate and the Bishop's Cross. Then the assistants place on him his Cope, after which the Archbishop delivers to him his Staff. When the singing is ended the Archbishop and the assistants lay their hands upon the Bishop's head, and the Archbishop prays, "Our Father, etc., for ever and ever. Amen"—which is used here as a general prayer with special intention. Then the Bishop's Mitre is put on, and the Archbishop says a prayer very like our "Almighty God and most merciful Father" (said with us between the hymn and the formula "Receive the Holy Ghost"). The service closes with a Benediction.

exceedingly large bodies of Swedish settlers in the United States of America.[1]

Your Committee note with pleasure that a kind letter of greeting was also sent to our President by Bishop Skat Rørdam, Primate of Denmark, and they express an earnest hope that the friendly relations already existing between the peoples of Denmark and Norway, as well as Sweden, and English-speaking peoples everywhere may develop into closer relations of religious co-operation. Such co-operation would be specially valuable in the Mission field, where Norwegian missionaries are doing excellent work. There is also a large opening for such co-operation in the mercantile navies at sea, and in many seaports. Your Committee are aware that the Churches of the three countries are quite independent of one another, but they believe that a closer approach to one of them might favourably affect our relations with the others.

VII.

Presbyterian and other Non-episcopal Churches.

Many circumstances have led your Committee to pay special attention to the relations between the Presbyterian Churches and the Churches of the Anglican Communion. To many Presbyterians we owe a deep debt of gratitude for their contributions to sacred learning. We are equally indebted to them for many examples of holiness of life. With regard to their Churches, although their characteristics appear to vary in different countries, they have in many ways a special affinity with our own Communion. Wherever they have held closely to their traditions and professed standards of faith and government, as formulated at Westminster, they satisfy the first three of the four conditions of an approach to reunion laid down by the Lambeth Conference of 1888.[2] Even as regards the fourth, though they have not retained "the historic episcopate," it belongs to their principles to insist upon definite ordination as necessary for admission into their ministry. Their standards provide that "the work of ordination" should be "performed with due care, wisdom, gravity, and solemnity" "by imposition of hands and prayer, with fasting," by the presbytery; they regard and treat ordination as conferred by those who have themselves been ordained and are authorised to ordain others.[3]

[1] It is important to notice that the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, in the year 1904, passed a Canon (No. 42) enabling a Bishop to approve the use of services in a language other than the English language. Under this Canon the Bishops of that Church may license the use of the Liturgy of the Church of Sweden by any Swedish congregations which may place themselves under their care, and this licence has in fact been given in several American dioceses.

[2] See above p. 122.

[3] See Appendix, note A. p. 434.

Many leading Presbyterian divines maintain the transmission of Orders by a regular succession through the presbyterate.[1] Facts such as these seemed to point to the Presbyterian Churches as those among the non-episcopal bodies with whom it would be most natural and hopeful at the present time for our own Church to enter into closer relations. Indeed, your Committee have been informed that in Australia conferences have been already held between committees of the General Synod of our own Communion and of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church with a view to possible reunion.

Your Committee fully recognise that a condition precedent to any project of reunion would be the attainment of a general agreement in doctrine and practice which would violate no essential principle of the Churches of our Communion. They admit that they are not satisfied that, except possibly in Australia, there is as yet evidence of a strong desire on the part of any of the Presbyterian Churches for a closer union with the Anglican Churches. The question of the recognition of Presbyterian orders seems to these Churches to present an insuperable obstacle. But the Committee feel that, before another Lambeth Conference can meet, the course of events may change the situation. In view of the possibilities of the future, they think that it would be a help to the cause of union to state that in their opinion it might be possible to make an approach to reunion on the basis of consecrations to the episcopate on lines suggested by such precedents as those of A.D. 1610.[2] Further arrangements would be necessary for the period of transition between the present condition of separation and full union on the basis of episcopal ordination. The Committee believe that such arrangements might be framed as would respect the convictions of those who had long and faithfully fulfilled their ministry in Presbyterian orders, without any surrender on our part of the essential principle, laid down in the Preface to our Ordinal, that those who are to minister the Word and Sacraments in the Churches of the Anglican Communion must have been episcopally ordained. In process of time the two streams of Christian life would mingle in the one Church, strengthened by the benefits which each of these contributory streams would be able to bring to the other.

Your Committee deliberately refrain from entering into any details, believing that these can only be profitably discussed when the spirit of unity has drawn the two bodies into closer fellowship with each other. But they have given very careful consideration to the matter, and they wish it to be understood that, in their

[1] See Appendix, note B. p. 437.

[2] In so far as these precedents involve consecration to the Episcopate *per saltum*, the conditions of such consecration would require careful investigation and statement.

opinion, members of the Presbyterian Churches who have, or may have, a real desire for fuller union with the Churches of our Communion may be assured that the way to such an arrangement as has been indicated above is not barred by obstacles which cannot be overcome by mutual considerateness, under the guidance of Him who is the Spirit alike of unity and truth.

Another remark may remove misunderstanding and make for peace. Anglican Churchmen must contend for a valid ministry as they understand it and regard themselves as absolutely bound to stipulate for this for themselves and for any Communion of which they are members. But it is no part of their duty, and therefore not their desire, to go further and pronounce negatively upon the value in God's sight of the ministry in other Communions.

Although for the reasons stated the Committee have given special attention to our relations with Presbyterian Churches, they have throughout their deliberations considered carefully and earnestly the relations between other non-episcopal Churches and the Churches of our Communion. With many of them, to whose ministers and members we owe, as to Presbyterians, many debts of gratitude for their learning and piety, and in whom we recognise manifold fruits of the Spirit, we desire to be associated in friendly intercourse and common service for the Kingdom of God. The Committee believe that few things tend more directly to godly union and concord than co-operation between members of different Communions in all matters pertaining to the social and moral welfare of the people. It is in the common service of humanity, in the name of Him who is its Lord, that the ties of friendly relationship are most readily created and most surely strengthened.

Further, in the opinion of the Committee much could be done to promote a more cordial mutual understanding, which is the necessary preliminary to all projects of reunion, if the members of our Communion would take pains to study the doctrines and appreciate the position of those who are separated from us, and would be careful to avoid in speech and act anything savouring of intolerance or arrogance. Towards this end, the Committee recommend that private meetings of ministers and laymen of our own and other Churches should frequently be held, such as those which have taken place under the auspices of the "Christian Unity Association" in Scotland, in which, by common study of the Word of God, by frank and friendly discussion, and by united prayer, they could at once realise and deepen the sense of union in the fellowship of Christ. Meanwhile the Committee would commend to the Church an ideal of reunion which should include all the elements of divine truth now emphasised by separated bodies; in a word, the path of efforts towards reunion should be

not compromise for the sake of peace, but comprehension for the sake of truth, and the goal not uniformity but unity.

Finally, your Committee, recalling the words of the Report of the Committee on Church Unity appointed by the Lambeth Conference, 1897,[1] and of the Resolution of the Conference, No. 40,[2] venture to suggest that the constituted authorities of the several Churches of the Anglican Communion should, as opportunity offers, arrange conferences with representatives of different Christian bodies and meetings for united acknowledgment of the sins of division, and intercession for the growth of unity. Believing as they do that the Spirit of our Lord has been at this time calling us with special clearness to "consider seriously the dangers we are in by our unhappy divisions," they earnestly trust that one result of the present Conference may be a sustained effort to carry out this proposal in a spirit of humble faith, expectant hope, and patient charity.

JOHN SARUM,

Chairman.

APPENDIX OF EXTRACTS ON THE PRESBYTERIAN DOCTRINE OF ORDINATION.

NOTE A.

The earliest authoritative outline of Presbyterian Ministry in Scotland is contained in *The second book of Discipline agreed upon in the General Assembly*, 1578 . . . *according to which the Church Government is established by Law an*(*nis*) 1592 *and* 1690. In Chapter ii. 6, we read: "There are four ordinary functions or offices in the Kirk of God; the office of the Pastor, Minister or

[1] "We consider that the time has now arrived in which the constituted authorities of the various branches of our Communion should not merely make it known that they hold themselves in readiness to enter into brotherly conference with representatives of other Christian communities in the English-speaking races, but should themselves originate such conferences and especially arrange for representative meetings for united humiliation and intercession."

[2] "That the Bishops of the several Churches of the Anglican Communion be urged to appoint Committees of Bishops, where they have not been already appointed, to watch for opportunities of united prayer and mutual conference between representatives of different Christian bodies and to give counsel where counsel may be asked in this matter. That these Committees confer with and assist each other and regard themselves as responsible for reporting to the next Lambeth Conference what has been accomplished in this respect."

Bishop; the Doctor; the Presbyter or Elder; and the Deacon. 7. Their offices are ordinary and ought to continue perpetually in the Kirk, as necessary for the Government and Policy of the same. . . ." In Chapter iii. 1: "Vocation or calling is common to all that should bear office within the Kirk. . . . 4. This ordinary and outward calling has two parts, Election and Ordination. Election is the choosing out of a person or persons most able to the office that vaikes, by the judgment of the eldership and consent of the congregation, to whom the person or persons be appointed. . . . 6. Ordination is the separation and sanctifying of the person appointed to God and his Kirk after he be well tried and found qualified. The ceremonies of Ordination are fasting, earnest prayer, and imposition of hands of the eldership." In Chapter iv. 1: "Pastors, Bishops or Ministers are they who are appointed to particular congregations, which they rule by the Word of God and over the which they watch. . . . 3. No man ought to ingyre himself or usurp this office without lawful calling. . . . 6. Unto the Pastors appertains teaching the Word of God, in season and out of season, publicly and privately. . . . 7. Unto the Pastors only appertains the Administration of the Sacraments in like manner as the Administration of the Word. . . ."

In Chapter vii. 1, we read: "Elderships and Assemblies are commonly constitute of Pastors, Doctors and such as we commonly call Elders that labour not in Word and Doctrine. . . ." There is, however, no particular reference in this chapter to the power or method of Ordination or to the kind of Eldership (or Presbytery) to which it belongs. The function of Doctor has now lapsed, and the "Ruling Elder" is no longer associated with the Pastors or Presbyters in Ordination.

Next to this come three documents of the Westminster Assembly of Divines. The most important is (1) *The Form of Presbyterial Church Government agreed upon by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, examined and approved, anno* 1645, *by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland.* This, according to Dr. Sprott ("Worship and Offices of the Church of Scotland," p. 85, 1882), has not been revived either by Church or State since 1690. It is, however, except in its implied prohibition of superintendency, in intimate accord with standards that are still valid. Less detailed are (2) *The Confession of Faith agreed upon by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster: examined and approved anno* 1647 *by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland: and ratified by Act of Parliament* 1690; and (3) *The Larger Catechism of* 1648.

The Form of Presbyterial Church Government teaches under the head *Of the Church:*

"There is one general Church visible held forth in the New Testament. The ministry, oracles, and ordinances of the New Testament are given by Jesus Christ to the general Church visible . . . until His second coming. Particular visible Churches, members of the general Church, are also held forth in the New Testament."

Under the head *Of the Officers of the Church* it teaches that the ordinary and perpetual officers of the Church are pastors, teachers, and other church governors and deacons; and that *Pastors* have, with other rights of praying, reading, preaching, and teaching, the right to administer the Sacraments. *Of Ordination of Ministers* it teaches: "(1) No man ought to take upon him the office of a minister of the Word without a lawful calling; (2) Ordination is always to be continued in the Church; (3) Ordination is the solemn setting apart of a person to some public church office; (4) Every minister of the Word is to be ordained by imposition of hands and prayer, with fasting, by those preaching presbyters to whom it doth belong (1 Tim. v. 22, Acts xiv. 23, Acts xiii. 3)"; (5) "The power of ordering the whole work of ordination is in the whole presbytery."

Under *Directory for Ordination of a Minister* we read: "It being manifest by the Word of God that no man ought to take upon him the office of a minister of the Gospel until he be lawfully called and ordained thereunto; and that the work of ordination is to be performed with due care, wisdom, gravity, and solemnity." . . . The following requirements are made: (1) Testimonial; (2) Examination; (3) Ability to defend the orthodox doctrine; (4) A minister formerly ordained is to bring a testimonial of his ordination; (5) On the day of ordination is to be "a solemn fast . . . that they may the more earnestly join in prayer for a blessing on the ordinance of God and the labours of His servant. . . . The presbytery shall come to the place, or at least three or four ministers of the Word shall be sent thither from the presbytery; of which one appointed by the presbytery shall preach . . . concerning the office and duty of ministers of Christ"; (6) Questions to the ordinand and promise to "maintain the truths of the Gospel and the unity of the Church against error and schism, and to submit to the discipline of the Church." (8) "The presbytery, or the ministers sent from them for ordination, shall solemnly set him apart to the office and work of the ministry, by laying their hands on him, which is to be accompanied with a short prayer or blessing to this effect: "Thankfully acknowledging the great mercy of God in sending Jesus Christ . . . and for His ascension . . . and thence pouring out His Spirit and giving gifts to men, apostles, evangelists, prophets, pastors, and teachers; for the gathering and building up of His

Church, and for fitting and inclining this man to this great work [*Here let them impose hands on his head*]; to entreat Him to fit him with His Holy Spirit, to give him, who in His Name we thus set apart to this holy service, to fulfil the work of his ministry in all things," etc.

11. "And in case any person already ordained minister in Scotland, or in any other reformed Church, be designed to another congregation in England, he is to bring from that Church to the presbytery here . . . a sufficient testimonial of his ordination, of his life," etc.

The Westminster *Confession of Faith* in chapter xxv. 2 *Of the Church*, defines the visible Church as follows: "The visible Church, which is also Catholick or Universal under the Gospel (not confined to one nation as before, under the Law) consists of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion, together with their children, and is the Kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the House and family of God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of Salvation." It proceeds in section 3: "Unto this Catholic visible Church Christ hath given the ministry, oracles, and ordinances of God for the gathering and perfecting of the Saints in this life to the end of the world." In xxvii. 4: "There be only two Sacraments ordained by Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord: neither of which may be dispensed by any but by a minister lawfully ordained." In xxviii. 2 Baptism is specially assigned to "a minister of the Gospel lawfully called thereunto." The *Larger Catechism* has no detail of importance.

Note B.

The principles of the three Westminster formularies were argumentatively maintained by many writers in the struggle with Independency in the middle of the seventeenth century. A less-known book of this kind is the *Jus Divinum Regiminis Ecclesiastici by sundry Ministers of Christ within the City of London*, 1647, which maintains in particular the rights of "Ruling Elders." More often quoted is *Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici*, published by the Provincial Assembly of London, 1654. Both maintain the "divine right" of Presbyters, and assert that to them is committed the power of ordination and not to the congregation. The latter book, which aimed at comprehending "moderate" Episcopalians, and asserted "that the essence of the ministerial call consisteth in ordination," has apparently had great influence in Scotland, and is frequently referred to with approval by Scottish Divines.

In Principal George Hill's "View of the Constitution of the Church of Scotland," a book of authority (pp. 19, 20, ed. 3, 1835, we read: "Presbyterians hold that preaching the Word, dispensing the Sacraments, and exercising ecclesiastical jurisdiction over Christians are functions which in all ages belong to the office of a Christian teacher; that the right of performing every one of these ordinary functions was conveyed by the Apostles to all whom they ordained; that the persons who in the New Testament are indiscriminately named bishops and presbyters had the right of conveying to others all the powers with which they had been invested; and that every person who is ordained is as much a successor of the Apostles as any Christian teacher can be."

Dr. George W. Sprott, a leading member of the "Scottish Church Society" in the Established Church of Scotland, in "The Worship and Offices of the Church of Scotland" (pp. 187–8, Blackwood, 1882), writes: "It is the doctrine of the Church that Presbyters are the successors of the Apostles in all the ordinary functions of the ministry, and this excludes the claim of Prelates to ordain as an order above Presbyters, leaving them only the same power of order as that which belongs to all who are admitted to the Presbyterate. All the Reformed Churches held that there are only two orders in the ministry of divine appointment—those of Bishop or Presbyter and Deacon."

Dr. Charles Greig McCrie's "The Public Worship of Presbyterian Scotland" (Blackwood, 1892) gives the opinion of a leading minister and ex-moderator of the United Free Church of Scotland. The first words of the book are, "Presbyterianism is essentially a system of Church polity, having government by Presbyters for its distinguishing feature. It differs from Episcopacy in refusing to acknowledge any such governing power in the hands of prelates or diocesan bishops, as would constitute them an order in succession to the apostleship, separate from and superior to Presbyters; it is distinct from Independency, which lodges the government of the Church in the individual congregation. According to Presbyterian rule, all ecclesiastical authority is lodged in the Presbyters as the genuine Bishops of the New Testament, with whom is the true apostolical succession, the Presbyters being associated, for purposes ministerial or administrative, in congregational sessions, classical presbyteries, provincial synods, and general assemblies."

Dr. Robert Herbert Story, late Principal of Glasgow University, a writer of another school, in his Baird Lectures for 1897 ("The Apostolic Ministry in the Scottish Church"), writes as follows: "What is the Apostolic Ministry? To that question I reply: A ministry exercised in the spirit and after the example of the first planters of Christianity, and transmitted from them to us in an orderly and recognisable succession" (p. 4); and on p. 24: "The

minister of a Presbyterian congregation is just as much an *episcopos* as any member of the Roman hierarchy, in the primitive sense of the term. He is the president, the administrator, the representative of the congregation, and the primitive bishop was no more. He is chosen by the congregation and set apart to his office by his fellow-presbyters as was the primitive bishop." But elsewhere he seems to speak rather lightly of the importance of succession as a fact—*e.g.*, pp. 5 and 248.

In the "Book of Common Order . . . issued by the Church Service Society," ed. 3, 1874, pp. 225–6, the following prayers form part of the *Ordination Service*: "Especially do we at this time bless Thee, that when Jesus Christ Thy Son ascended up on high He condescended to call the children of men to be His ministers, and gave gifts unto them, that they might, as apostles and prophets, lay the foundations of His Church, and as evangelists, pastors and teachers, in perpetual succession, enlarge and feed and guide the same, promising to be with them always until His second coming in majesty to judge the world.

"And now, O God, look down, we earnestly beseech Thee, with favour upon this thy servant who is called and offers himself to take part in this great work. Cleanse him from all iniquity; purify and comfort his heart. And as we in Thy name, do by the imposition of our [*Here the presiding Presbyter shall lay his hands upon the head of the Candidate, the other Presbyters standing near laying on each his hand*] hands, ordain him a Presbyter in Thy Church, and commit unto him authority to minister Thy Word and Sacraments, O do Thou, who healest what is infirm, and suppliest what is wanting, receive and strengthen him for Thy service, giving him the unction of the Holy Ghost."

This book has no official authority, but it expresses clearly the opinion of its respected compilers and of the large number of ministers who use it. It probably represents the tenor of the form of Ordination generally used.

XIX.

Report of the Committee Appointed in 1897 to Consider the Relation of Religious Communities within the Church to the Episcopate.

[Presented to the Lambeth Conference, 1908.]

The following Resolutions were adopted by the Lambeth Conference of 1897, and the Report [1] referred to in the first of these Resolutions was presented to the Conference and published with the Encyclical Letter and Resolutions of the Conference:—

"That this Conference recognises with thankfulness the revival alike of Brotherhoods and Sisterhoods and of the Office of Deaconess in our branch of the Church, and commends to the attention of the Church the Report of the Committee appointed to consider the Relation of Religious Communities to the Episcopate." (Resolution 11.)

"In view of the importance of the further development and wise direction of such Communities, the Conference requests the Committee to continue its labours and to present a further Report to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury in July, 1898." (Resolution 12.)

In accordance with the first of these Resolutions the Committee, or such members of it as were able to take part personally or by letter in its deliberations, drew up the Report hereto appended, which was duly transmitted to the Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Temple) on November 28, 1898.

Appended also is a copy of the Letter written by the then Bishop of Winchester (now Archbishop of Canterbury) as Chairman of the Committee to Archbishop Temple, November 11th, 1901.

This letter explains the circumstances which caused the delay in the publication of the Report prepared in 1898. The Report, with the covering letter prefixed to it, was, by Archbishop Temple's direction, published in 1902, and circulated to all members of the Anglican Episcopate.

[1] See above, p. 215.

The procedure recommended in 1897 has thus been duly followed, in the hope that the publication of the Report and its consideration by such persons as are specially interested in the subject might result in the gradual formation of a sound and deliberate judgment upon the points to which it refers, although, as is obvious, the recommendations it contains have no authoritative or binding character.

Of the original Committee of twenty-one members appointed in 1897, eight have passed away, and some of those who remain are now for different reasons unable to give us practical help. Some of the vacant places have during the last five years been filled up by the appointment of the present Bishops of London, Winchester, and Wakefield.

The Committee, thus reinforced, has held occasional meetings, and its members have been in touch with the authorities of the various Religious Communities, and with those who are specially occupied in promoting the revival of the ancient office of Deaconess.

The Committee desires now to express its adherence to the recommendations contained in the Preliminary Report (November 28th, 1898). The Committee further invites the acceptance by the Lambeth Conference of the following recommendation :—

"That the Archbishop of Canterbury be requested to transmit a copy of this present Report to every Diocesan Bishop in the Anglican Communion, accompanying it with a request that it may be duly considered, and that each Province of the Anglican Communion will, if it consents to do so, send to him, through its Metropolitan, before July 31st, 1910, a statement of the judgment formed in that Province upon the subject dealt with in the Report."

The Committee recommends that, from the information thus officially obtained, a statement of facts and (if the communications received render this possible) a series of definite recommendations be prepared by the Consultative Committee of the Lambeth Conference or such Council of Reference, if any, as the Conference may have formed.

The Committee believes that in this way the opinion of the Church can best be ascertained and guided upon a subject of great and increasing importance. The development of the Community system in different parts of the world is necessarily subject to very different conditions, and it is important that all the features of these variations, in different parts of the Anglican Communion, should be well and duly considered, and that every opportunity should be given for the expression of local opinion on the basis of well-weighed experience before the final adoption of any line of definite recommendation as to the policy of the Church at large.

The foregoing remarks and recommendations have reference to

the relations to the Episcopate of Religious Communities in the stricter sense of the term.

The other branch of the subject which was referred eleven years ago to the Committee is that of the revival of the Order or Office of Deaconess. To that question your Committee has, through some of its members, given assiduous attention; and it is not without a sense of disappointment that the Committee recommends yet again the postponement of formal or authoritative corporate action throughout the Church.

The Committee has had before it a great deal of information upon what has been and is being done both in England and in the United States, as well as in Indian and other Mission fields for the development and organisation of Deaconess' work. It is obliged to recognise the fact that the progress of this work has been slow, though steady, and that at present it derives its strength from comparatively few centres. The Committee, having regard both to the lessons of the Church's history in the past, and to the advice of those now most interested in the Deaconess system, is of opinion that it would be inadvisable at this stage, at once so inchoate and so tentative, to lay down authoritative directions which might tend prematurely to stereotype the lines of future expansion. The Committee therefore regards it as likely to be most beneficial to the interests of the Deaconess system that the Report be again postponed, and that further time should thus be allowed for freedom of growth and development in the Deaconess work in the different conditions prevailing in different Dioceses.

The Committee takes this opportunity to call the attention of the Conference to the very important recommendations of the Lambeth Conference, 1897, No. 2 B,[1] which dealt with the four subjects of (1) the title, (2) the training, of the Deaconess, (3) the joint existence, side by side, of the two systems (*a*) of community, (*b*) of individual life, and (4) the desirability that, as far as possible, there should be an approximation "in the manner of setting apart and licensing Deaconesses in the various Dioceses of our Communion."

RANDALL CANTUAR:
Chairman.

June 23rd, 1908.

COMMITTEE ON "THE RELATION OF RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES WITHIN THE CHURCH TO THE EPISCOPATE."

The Committee appointed by the Lambeth Conference to consider and report on "The Relation of Religious Communities within the Church to the Episcopate" having been instructed to make a Report in the month of July, 1898, desire to communicate

[1] See above, p. 216.

to your Grace the following propositions as containing principles in which a basis of agreement might be found.

A. It is essential for a due relation—

1. That there should be on the part of the Episcopate a recognition of Religious Communities within the Church of England, and of the Religious Life as expressed in the Rule of such Communities.
2. That there should be on the part of the Communities a distinct recognition of the authority of the Episcopate.

B. *The Visitor.*

1. The Bishop of the Diocese should be, *ex officio*, Visitor of the Mother-House of any Community established in his Diocese.

   The Committee have had before them several proposals for the creation or election of a Visitor in the case of the Bishop of the Diocese being unwilling to accept the office. The Committee recommend that in such cases the Community should elect its own Visitor, subject to the approval of such election by the Archbishop or Metropolitan of the Province.

   As to the visitation of Branch-Houses provision should be made in the Statutes of the Community to determine the co-relation and co-ordination of the authority of the Visitor of the Mother-House and that of the Bishop of the Diocese in which the Branch-House is situated.

2. The functions of the Visitor are

   (1) To insure that the constitution of the Community as originally established, or subsequently modified by Statute, has received authoritative sanction. Such authoritative sanction should be derived either from an Episcopal Visitor or from the Archbishop or Metropolitan of the Province.

   (2) To secure, by personal Visitation either *proprio motu* or on appeal, that the Statutes and Rule of the Constitution are duly observed. Such appeal should be open to every member of the Community.

3. Apart from visitatorial power, it belongs to the ordinary authority of the Bishop of the Diocese to license the Clergy who are to minister in the Chapel of the Mother-House of the Communities, and to regulate the due administration of the Sacraments and the Services appointed in the Book of Common Prayer.

   In the Branch-Houses the Committee recommend that the Ministering Clergy shall be licensed by the Bishop of the Diocese on the nomination of the Visitor, or of the Governing Body, of the Mother-House.

C. The Constitution of each Community should contain—

a. The distinct recognition of the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England as supreme.

b. Provision for formation of a proper Governing Body.

c. Provision for rules for imposition of, and release from, vows, solemn promises, or engagements with the Community; it being secured that the formal Profession of the Members of a Community should be always made before the Bishop of the Diocese, or some deputy appointed by him for that purpose.

d. Provision for due rules as to additional Offices, books of Devotion, and ornaments and appliances of House and Chapel.

e. Provision for due rules as to possession and disposition of property.

D. In the opinion of the Committee time should be given to new Communities to deliberate over their Statutes under provisional sanction.

As a matter of course several points relating to the life and work of Religious Communities have in the course of our deliberations and inquiries come incidentally before us, but on these we have expressed no opinion, as they do not fall within the terms of our reference.

For the same reason, though profoundly convinced of its bearing upon the future of Religious Communities, we have made no special reference to the means by which the inner life of their members can be directed, their mental powers strengthened, their capacities for usefulness in the Kingdom of our Blessed Lord developed.

W. Oxon:

November 28th, 1898. *Chairman.*

COVERING LETTER.

To His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, President of the Lambeth Conference of 1897.

November 11th, 1901.

MY LORD ARCHBISHOP,

In the Autumn of 1898 your Committee,[1] through its Chairman the Bishop of Oxford, Dr. Stubbs, transmitted to your Grace the Report which had been agreed upon by such members of the Committee as had been able to take part in its deliberations upon the first branch of the subject entrusted to it; and the Chairman, in accordance with the request of the Committee, further informed your Grace of the hope we then entertained that a report upon the second branch of the subject (Deaconesses) might be prepared and presented at an early date. Your Grace, on informally receiving the Preliminary Report thus transmitted, expressed an opinion that its formal presentation and publication might with advantage be postponed until the whole Report in both its parts was complete.

It has seemed to your Committee to be desirable to present again to your Grace the original Report, notwithstanding the fact that the second branch of the subject has not yet been dealt with. Its publication, in such form as your Grace may think desirable, is somewhat anxiously awaited, and a prolonged delay might, in

[1] The Committee, as appointed in July, 1897, was as follows :—

Bishop of Albany (Dr. Doane).
" Bloemfontein (Dr. Hicks).
" Calcutta (Dr. Johnson).
" Christchurch, N.Z. (Dr. Julius).
Bishop in Corea (Dr. Corfe).
Bishop of Fond du Lac (Dr. Grafton).
" Grahamstown (Dr. Webb).
" Goulburn (Dr. Chalmers).
" Lincoln (Dr. King).
" London (Dr. Creighton).
" Marlborough (Dr. Earle).
" Oxford (Dr. Stubbs) (*Chairman*).
" Pennsylvania (Dr. Whitaker).
" Quebec (Dr. Dunn).
" Reading (Dr. Randall) (*Secretary*).
" Rochester (Dr. Talbot).
" Rockhampton (Dr. Dawes).
" St. Andrews (Dr. Wilkinson).
" Vermont (Dr. Hall).
" Wakefield (Dr. Walsham How).
" Washington (Dr. Satterlee).
" Winchester (Dr. Davidson).

the opinion of your Committee, lead to misapprehension as to the cause. Circumstances have led to the Committee finding itself unable to proceed as rapidly as had been expected in the preparation of a Report upon the "Deaconess" question, and we are reluctantly obliged to ask your Grace to sanction a further postponement, and also to add a few additional members to the existing Committee. It is obviously of the highest importance that we should if possible secure a firm co-operation between the action taken in England and the action taken in the United States in a matter of such moment, and the necessary consultation cannot be carried on without considerable delays. The loss your Committee has sustained in the death of two of its foremost members, specially conversant with such questions, has hampered our action. We have good hope, however, that before very long we may be able to report upon the subject and to make recommendations upon such matters as the following:—

(1) The qualifications necessary for the Office of Deaconess, as to age, training, and freedom from domestic or other responsibilities.
(2) The manner in which a Deaconess ought to be set apart for her Office.
(3) The nature of the obligations which ought to be laid upon her and of the duties she ought to discharge.
(4) The form of Commission and of Licence which she ought to hold.
(5) The Rules which ought to be observed when a Deaconess removes to another Diocese from that in which she was set apart.

Upon all these points we are obtaining information, and are taking counsel with those whose special knowledge of the subject enables them to give us material aid.

In the meantime we now desire, on behalf of the Committee appointed in the Conference of 1897, formally to present to your Grace the appended Report upon the first branch of the subject —that, namely, which concerns the Relation to the Episcopate of "Religious Communities" in the stricter sense of the term.

RANDALL WINTON:

Chairman.

LIST OF BISHOPS ATTENDING THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE OF 1920.

In the arrangement of the following list of Bishops attending the Conference, the general order followed is that of the date of Consecration. In the case of Primates and Metropolitans the order followed, speaking generally, is regulated by the priority of the formation of the Province. The Bishops of London, Durham, Winchester, and Meath have an ancient priority which has been recognised in the list.

1 Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Rev. R. T. Davidson, D.D.) 1903. April 25th, 1891

2 Archbishop of York (Most Rev. C. G. Lang, D.D.) 1909. May 1st, 1901.

3 Archbishop of Armagh (Most Rev. C. F. D'Arcy, D.D.) 1920. February 24th, 1903.

4 Bishop of Calcutta, Metropolitan of India (Most Rev. F. Westcott, D.D.) 1919. November 30th, 1905.

5 Archbishop of Sydney (Most Rev. J. C. Wright, D.D.) 1910. August 24th, 1909.

6 Archbishop of Capetown (Most Rev. W. M. Carter, D.D.) 1909. September 29th, 1891.

7 Archbishop of Rupert's Land (Most Rev. S. P. Matheson, D.D.) 1905. November 15th, 1903.

8 Archbishop of the West Indies and Bishop of Guiana (Most Rev. E. A. Parry, D.D.) 1917. December 28th, 1900.

9 Archbishop of Melbourne (Most Rev. H. Lowther Clarke, D.D.) 1905. November 1st, 1902.

10 Archbishop of Nova Scotia (Most Rev. C. L. Worrell, D.D.) 1915. October 18th, 1904;

11 Archbishop of Brisbane (Most Rev. St. C. G. A. Donaldson, D.D.) 1905. October 28th, 1904.

12 Archbishop of Algoma (Most Rev. G. Thorneloe, D.D.) 1915. January 6th, 1897.

13 Bishop of Brechin, Primus of the Scottish Episcopal Church (Most Rev. W. J. F. Robberds, D.D.) 1908. January 6th, 1904.

14 Archbishop of Wales (Most Rev. A. G. Edwards, D.D.) 1920. March 25th, 1889.

15 Bishop of Tennessee (Right Rev. T. F. Gailor, D.D.) July 25th, 1893.

16 Bishop of London (Right Rev. A. F. Winnington-Ingram, D.D.) November 30th, 1897.

17 Bishop of Durham (Right Rev. H. Hensley Henson, D.D.) February 2nd, 1918.

18 Bishop of Winchester (Right Rev. E. S. Talbot, D.D.) October 18th, 1895.
19 Bishop of Meath, Premier Bishop of Ireland (Most Rev. B. J. Plunket, D.D.) May 13th, 1913.
20 Assistant Bishop of Bath and Wells (Right Rev. W. H. Stirling, D.D.) December 21st, 1869.
21 Assistant Bishop for Tonga (Right Rev. A. Willis, D.D.) February 2nd, 1872.
22 Bishop R. S. Copleston, D.D. December 28th, 1875.
23 Bishop of Bath and Wells (Right Rev. G. W. Kennion, D.D.) November 30th, 1882.
24 Assistant Bishop of Winchester (Right Rev. E. G. Ingham, D.D.) February 24th, 1883.
25 Bishop of Bethlehem (Right Rev. E. Talbot, D.D.) May 27th, 1887.
26 Bishop of Southern Ohio (Right Rev. Boyd Vincent, D.D.) January 25th, 1889.
27 Bishop H. H. Montgomery, D.D. May 1st, 1889.
28 Bishop of Beverley (Right Rev. R. J. Crosthwaite, D.D.) June 11th, 1889.
29 Bishop of Ohio (Right Rev. W. A. Leonard, D.D.) October 12th, 1889.
30 Assistant Bishop of St. Albans (Right Rev. E. N. Hodges, D.D.) April 25th, 1890.
31 Bishop of Christchurch (Right Rev. C. Julius, D.D.) May 1st, 1890.
32 Bishop of Wakefield (Right Rev. G. R. Eden, D.D.) October 18th, 1890.
33 Bishop of Coventry (Right Rev. H. W. Yeatman-Biggs, D.D.) September 29th, 1891.
34 Bishop of Texas (Right Rev. G. H. Kinsolving, D.D.) October 12th, 1892.
35 Bishop of Willesden (Right Rev. W. W. Perrin, D.D.) March 25th, 1893.
36 Bishop (Missionary) of Tokyo (Right Rev. J. McKim, D.D.) June 14th, 1893.
37 Assistant Bishop of Lagos (Right Rev. I. Oluwole, D.D.) June 29th, 1893.
38 Bishop of Saskatchewan (Right Rev. J. A. Newnham, D.D.) August 6th, 1893.
39 Assistant Bishop of Birmingham (Right Rev. A. Hamilton Baynes, D.D.) September 29th, 1893.
40 Bishop of Massachusetts (Right Rev. W. Lawrence, D.D.) October 5th, 1893.
41 Bishop of North Carolina (Right Rev. J. B. Cheshire, D.D.) October 15th, 1893.
42 Bishop of Vermont (Right Rev. A. C. A. Hall, D.D.) February 2nd, 1894.
43 Bishop of Bunbury (Right Rev. C. Wilson, D.D.) June 11th, 1894.
44 Bishop of Manchester (Right Rev. E. A. Knox, D.D.) December 28th, 1894.
45 Bishop G. F. Browne, D.D. April 21st, 1895.

46 Bishop of Rochester (Right Rev. J. R. Harmer, D.D.) May 23rd, 1895.
47 Bishop of Riverina (Right Rev. E. A. Anderson, D.D.) June 29th, 1895.
48 Bishop of Western China (Right Rev. W. W. Cassels, D.D.) October 18th, 1895.
49 Bishop G. Mott Williams, D.D. May 1st, 1896.
50 Bishop of Grantham (Right Rev. J. E. Hine, D.D.) June 29th, 1896.
51 Bishop of Crediton (Right Rev. R. E. Trefusis, D.D.) February 24th, 1897.
52 Bishop of St. David's (Right Rev. J. Owen, D.D.) May 1st, 1897.
53 Bishop of Connecticut (Right Rev. C. B. Brewster, D.D.) October 28th, 1897.
54 Bishop of Southampton (Right Rev. J. Macarthur, D.D.) September 29th, 1898.
55 Bishop (Missionary) of Asheville (Right Rev. J. M. Horner, D.D.) December 28th, 1898.
56 Bishop (Missionary) of Southern Brazil (Right Rev. L. L. Kinsolving, D.D.) January 6th, 1899.
57 Bishop of Sacramento (Right Rev. W. H. Moreland, D.D.) January 25th, 1899.
58 Bishop of Bangor (Right Rev. W. H. Williams, D.D.) February 2nd, 1899.
59 Bishop of Osaka (Right Rev. H. J. Foss, D.D.) February 2nd, 1899.
60 Bishop of Madras (Right Rev. H. Whitehead, D.D.) June 29th, 1899.
61 Bishop G. L. King, D.D. June 29th, 1899.
62 Bishop of West Virginia (Right Rev. W. L. Gravatt, D.D.) November 10th, 1899.
63 Bishop of West Missouri (Right Rev. S. C. Partridge, D.D.) February 2nd, 1900.
64 Bishop of Liverpool (Right Rev. F. J. Chavasse, D.D.) April 25th, 1900.
65 Bishop of Willochra (Right Rev. G. White, D.D.) August 24th, 1900.
66 Bishop of Salisbury (Right Rev. F. E. Ridgeway, D.D.) February 17th, 1901.
67 Bishop of Natal (Right Rev. F. S. Baines, D.D.) August 4th, 1901.
68 Bishop of Jarrow (Right Rev. J. N. Quirk, D.D.) October 18th, 1901.
69 Bishop of Southwell (Right Rev. E. Hoskyns, D.D.) October 18th, 1901.
70 Bishop of St. John's, Kaffraria (Right Rev. J. W. Williams, D.D.) November 30th, 1901.
71 Bishop (Missionary) of Southern Florida (Right Rev. C. Mann, D.D.) December 4th, 1901.
72 Bishop of Western New York (Right Rev. C. H. Brent, D.D.) December 19th, 1901.
73 Bishop (Missionary) of Olympia (Right Rev. F. W. Keator, D.D.) January 8th, 1902.

74 Bishop of Long Island (Right Rev. F. Burgess, D.D.) January 15th, 1902.
75 Bishop of North-West Australia (Right Rev. G. Trower, D.D.) January 25th, 1902.
76 Bishop in Argentina (Right Rev. E. F. Every, D.D.) July 14th, 1902.
77 Bishop of Nagpur (Right Rev. E. Chatterton, D.D.) March 25th, 1903.
78 Bishop of Zululand (Right Rev. W. L. Vyvyan, D.D.) May 21st, 1903.
79 Bishop of Thetford (Right Rev. J. P. A. Bowers, D.D.) June 29th, 1903.
80 Bishop of Colombo (Right Rev. E. A. Copleston, D.D.) August 30th, 1903.
81 Bishop of Shantung (Right Rev. G. D. Iliff, D.D.) October 28th, 1903.
82 Bishop of Newark (Right Rev. E. S. Lines, D.D.) November 18th, 1903.
83 Bishop of Croydon (Right Rev. H. H. Pereira, D.D.) January 25th, 1904.
84 Bishop of Glasgow (Right Rev. A. E. Campbell, D.D.) February 24th, 1904.
85 Bishop E. W. Osborne, D.D. October 23rd, 1904.
86 Bishop (Missionary) of Hankow (Right Rev. L. H. Roots, D.D.) November 14th, 1904.
87 Bishop of Moray, Ross, and Caithness (Right Rev. A. J. Maclean, D.D.) December 21st, 1904.
88 Bishop of Huron (Right Rev. D. Williams, D.D.) January 6th, 1905.
89 Bishop in South Tokyo (Right Rev. C. H. Boutflower, D.D.) January 25th, 1905.
90 Bishop of Harrisburg (Right Rev. J. H. Darlington, D.D.) April 26th, 1905.
91 Bishop of Gloucester (Right Rev. E. C. S. Gibson, D.D.) June 1st, 1905.
92 Bishop of Llandaff (Right Rev. J. P. Hughes, D.D.) June 1st, 1905.
93 Bishop of St. Helena (Right Rev. W. A. Holbech, D.D.)
94 Bishop of Ely (Right Rev. F. H. Chase, D.D.) [June 24th, 1905 October 18th, 1905.
95 Assistant Bishop of Salisbury (Right Rev. A. E. Joscelyne, D.D.) October 18th, 1905.
96 Coadjutor Bishop of Missouri (Right Rev. F. F. Johnson, D.D.) November 2nd, 1905.
97 Bishop of Knaresborough (Right Rev. L. F. M. B. Smith, D.D.) December 27th, 1905.
98 Bishop of Adelaide (Right Rev. A. Nutter Thomas, D.D.) February 2nd, 1906.
99 Assistant Bishop of Ely (Right Rev. H. M. E. Price, D.D.) February 2nd, 1906.
100 Bishop of Michigan (Right Rev. C. D. Williams, D.D.) February 7th, 1906.
101 Bishop of Western Michigan (Right Rev. J. N. McCormick, D.D.) February 14th, 1906.

102 Bishop of Milwaukee (Right Rev. W. W. Webb, D.D.) February 24th, 1906.
103 Bishop of Chester (Right Rev. H. L. Paget, D.D.) April 25th, 1906.
104 Bishop of Bristol (Right Rev. G. Nickson, D.D.) June 29th, 1906.
105 Bishop of Fredericton (Right Rev. J. A. Richardson, D.D.) November 30th, 1906.
106 Bishop of Argyll and the Isles (Right Rev. K. Mackenzie, D.D.) January 25th, 1907.
107 Bishop of South Carolina (Right Rev. W. A. Guerry, D.D.) September 15th, 1907.
108 Bishop in Chekiang (Right Rev. H. J. Molony, D.D.) January 25th, 1908.
109 Bishop of Clogher (Right Rev. M. Day, D.D.) January 25th, 1908.
110 Bishop of St. Andrews, Dunkeld, and Dunblane (Right Rev. C. E. Plumb, D.D.) March 25th, 1908.
111 Bishop of Bombay (Right Rev. E. J. Palmer, D.D.) May 28th, 1908.
112 Bishop in Polynesia (Right Rev. T. C. Twitchell, D.D.) May 28th, 1908.
113 Bishop in Khartoum (Right Rev. Ll. H. Gwynne, D.D.) October 11th, 1908.
114 Bishop of Zanzibar (Right Rev. F. Weston, D.D.) October 11th, 1908.
115 Bishop of Montreal (Right Rev. J. C. Farthing, D.D.) January 6th, 1909.
116 Bishop of Washington (Right Rev. A. Harding, D.D.) January 25th, 1909.
117 Bishop of Colchester (Right Rev. R. H. Whitcombe, D.D.) February 2nd, 1909.
118 Bishop of Rockhampton (Right Rev. G. D. Halford, D.D.) February 2nd, 1909.
119 Bishop of Guildford (Right Rev. J. H. G. Randolph, D.D.) February 21st, 1909.
120 Bishop of Toronto (Right Rev. J. F. Sweeny, D.D.) March 25th, 1909.
121 Bishop (Missionary) of Wyoming (Right Rev. N. S. Thomas, D.D.) May 6th, 1909.
122 Bishop of Moosonee (Right Rev. J. G. Anderson, D.D.) May 16th, 1909.
123 Bishop of Maine (Right Rev. B. Brewster, D.D.) June 17th, 1909.
124 Bishop of St. Albans (Right Rev. M. B. Furse, D.D.) June 29th, 1909.
125 Bishop of Burnley (Right Rev. H. Henn, D.D.) July 11th, 1909.
126 Bishop of Sheffield (Right Rev. L. H. Burrows, D.D.) July 11th, 1909.
127 Bishop of Singapore (Right Rev. C. J. Ferguson-Davie, D.D.) August 24th, 1909.
128 Bishop of Barrow (Right Rev. C. West Watson, D.D.) September 21st, 1909.

129 Bishop of Whalley (Right Rev. A. G. Rawstorne, D.D.) September 21st, 1909.
130 Bishop of Maryland (Right Rev. J. G. Murray, D.D.) September 29th, 1909.
131 Bishop of Derby (Right Rev. C. T. Abraham, D.D.) November 30th, 1909.
132 Bishop of Honan (Right Rev. W. C. White, D.D.) November 30th, 1909.
133 Bishop in Kwangsi and Hunan (Right Rev. W. Banister, D.D.) November 30th, 1909.
134 Bishop in Kyushu, South Japan (Right Rev. A. Lea, D.D.) November 30th, 1909.
135 Bishop of Auckland (Right Rev. A. W. Averill, D.D January 16th, 1910.
136 Bishop of Rangoon (Right Rev. R. S. Fyffe, D.D.) January 16th, 1910.
137 Bishop of New Guinea (Right Rev. G. Sharp, D.D.) April 25th, 1910.
138 Bishop of Norwich (Right Rev. B. Pollock, D.D.) April 25th, 1910.
139 Bishop of Lichfield (Right Rev. J. A. Kempthorne, D.D.) May 16th, 1910.
140 Bishop of Edinburgh (Right Rev. G. H. S. Walpole, D.D.) June 24th, 1910.
141 Bishop of Nyasaland (Right Rev. T. C. Fisher, D.D.) June 24th, 1910.
142 Bishop of Sierra Leone (Right Rev. J. Walmsley, D.D.) June 24th, 1910.
143 Bishop of New Westminster (Right Rev. A. U. de Pencier, D.D.) July 25th, 1910.
144 Bishop of Lucknow (Right Rev. G. H. Westcott, D.D.) November 6th, 1910.
145 Bishop (Missionary) of Western Nebraska (Right Rev. G. A. Beecher, D.D.) November 30th, 1910.
146 Bishop (Missionary) of North Texas (Right Rev. E. A. Temple, D.D.) December 15th, 1910.
147 Assistant Bishop of Bloemfontein (Right Rev. F. R. T. Balfour, M.A.) January 1st, 1911.
148 Bishop of Southern Rhodesia (Right Rev. F. H. Beaven, D.D.) January 1st, 1911.
149 Bishop of Rhode Island (Right Rev. J. D. Perry, D.D.) January 6th, 1911.
150 Bishop of Antigua (Right Rev. E. Hutson, D.D.) January 15th, 1911.
151 Bishop (Missionary) of Arizona (Right Rev. J. W. Atwood, D.D.) January 18th, 1911.
152 Bishop (Missionary) of Oklahoma (Right Rev. T. P. Thurston, D.D.) January 25th, 1911.
153 Bishop of New York (Right Rev. C. S. Burch, D.D.) February 24th, 1911.
154 Assistant Bishop of Llandaff (Right Rev. O. T. L. Crossley, D.D.) April 25th, 1911.
155 Bishop of Oxford (Right Rev. H. M. Burge, D.D.) May 25th, 1911.

156 Bishop in Corea (Right Rev. M. N. Trollope, D.D.) July 25th, 1911.
157 Bishop of Gibraltar (Right Rev. H. J. C. Knight, D.D.) July 25th, 1911.
158 Bishop of Taunton (Right Rev. C. F. De Salis, D.D.) July 25th, 1911.
159 Bishop of Grafton (Right Rev. C. H. Druitt, D.D.) August 6th, 1911.
160 Bishop of George (Right Rev. H. B. Sidwell, D.D.) September 29th, 1911.
161 Bishop of Western Massachusetts (Right Rev. T. F. Davies, D.D.) October 18th, 1911.
162 Bishop of Birmingham (Right Rev. H. R. Wakefield, D.D.) October 28th, 1911.
163 Bishop of Pennsylvania (Right Rev. P. M. Rhinelander, D.D.) October 28th, 1911.
164 Suffragan Bishop of Pennsylvania (Right Rev. T. J. Garland, D.D.) October 28th, 1911.
165 Bishop of Kensington (Right Rev. J. P. Maud, D.D.) December 28th, 1911.
166 Bishop of Uganda (Right Rev. J. J. Willis, D.D.) January 25th, 1912.
167 Bishop of Ottawa (Right Rev. J. C. Roper, D.D.) February 24th, 1912.
168 Bishop of Sodor and Man (Right Rev. J. D. Thompson, D.D.) March 25th, 1912.
169 Bishop of Cork, Cloyne, and Ross (Right Rev. C. B. Dowse, D.D.) June 11th, 1912.
170 Bishop of Kimberley and Kuruman (Right Rev. W. Gore-Browne, M.A.) June 29th, 1912.
171 Bishop of Chichester (Right Rev. W. O. Burrows, D.D.) July 25th, 1912.
172 Bishop of Athabasca (Right Rev. E. F. Robins, D.D.) November 24th, 1912.
173 Bishop of Dornakal (Right Rev. V. S. Azariah, D.D.) December 29th, 1912.
174 Bishop of Accra (Right Rev. M. S. O'Rorke, D.D.) January 25th, 1913.
175 Assistant Bishop of Natal (Right Rev. F. Roach, D.D.) January 25th, 1913.
176 Bishop of North Queensland (Right Rev. J. O. Feetham, D.D.) April 25th, 1913.
177 Bishop of Leicester (Right Rev. N. McL. Lang, D.D.) May 1st, 1913.
178 Bishop of Ontario (Right Rev. E. J. Bidwell, D.D.) June 24th, 1913.
179 Bishop of Mackenzie River (Right Rev. J. R. Lucas, D.D.) August 31st, 1913.
180 Bishop of Hull (Right Rev. F. Gurdon, D.D.) September 29th, 1913.
181 Bishop of Richmond (Right Rev. F. C. Kilner, D.D.) September 29th, 1913.
182 Bishop of Jamaica (Right Rev. G. F. C. De Carteret, D.D.) October 18th, 1913.

183 Bishop of Buckingham (Right Rev. E. D. Shaw, D.D.) January 1st, 1914.
184 Bishop in North China (Right Rev. F. L. Norris, D.D.) January 1st, 1914.
185 Coadjutor Bishop of Ohio (Right Rev. F. Du Moulin, D.D.) January 8th, 1914.
186 Bishop (Missionary) of New Mexico (Right Rev. F. B. Howden, D.D.) January 14th, 1914.
187 Bishop of Waiapu (Right Rev. W. W. Sedgwick, D.D.) February 22nd, 1914.
188 Bishop of Chelmsford (Right Rev. J. E. Watts-Ditchfield, D.D.) February 24th, 1914.
189 Bishop of St. Edmundsbury and Ipswich (Right Rev. H. B. Hodgson, D.D.) February 24th, 1914.
190 Bishop of Edmonton (Right Rev. H. A. Gray, D.D.) March 25th, 1914.
191 Bishop of Northern Rhodesia (Right Rev. A. J. W. May, D.D.) April 25th, 1914.
192 Bishop of Newcastle, N.S.W. (Right Rev. R. Stephen, D.D.) September 13th, 1914.
193 Bishop in Jerusalem (Right Rev. R. MacInnes, D.D.) October 28th, 1914.
194 Bishop of Virginia (Right Rev. W. C. Brown, D.D.) October 28th, 1914.
195 Bishop of Kingston-on-Thames (Right Rev. S. M. Taylor, D.D.) January 6th, 1915.
196 Bishop in Assam (Right Rev. H. Pakenham-Walsh, D.D.) January 10th, 1915.
197 Bishop of New Jersey (Right Rev. P. Matthews, D.D.) January 25th, 1915.
198 Bishop of Quebec (Right Rev. L. W. Williams, D.D.) January 25th, 1915.
199 Bishop of Kootenay (Right Rev. A. J. Doull, D.D.) February 24th, 1915.
200 Bishop of Goulburn (Right Rev. L. B. Radford, D.D.) August 24th, 1915.
201 Bishop of Carpentaria (Right Rev. H. Newton, D.D.) September 21st, 1915.
202 Bishop of Stafford (Right Rev. L. P. Crawfurd, D.D.) September 29th, 1915.
203 Bishop of Swansea (Right Rev. E. L. Bevan, D.D.) September 30th, 1915.
204 Coadjutor Bishop of Newark (Right Rev. W. R. Stearly, D.D.) October 21st, 1915.
205 Bishop of Grahamstown (Right Rev. F. R. Phelps, D.D.) October 31st, 1915.
206 Bishop in Tinnevelly and Madura (Right Rev. E. H. M. Waller, D.D.) November 28th, 1915.
207 Bishop of Kilmore, Elphin, and Ardagh (Right Rev. W. R. Moore, D.D.) November 30th, 1915.
208 Bishop of Newcastle (Right Rev. H. L. Wild, D.D.) November 30th, 1915.
209 Bishop of Ossory, Ferns, and Leighlin (Right Rev. J. A. F. Gregg, D.D.) December 28th, 1915.

210 Bishop of Dover (Right Rev. H. E. Bilbrough, D.D.) February 24th, 1916.
211 Bishop of Derry and Raphoe (Right Rev. J. I. Peacocke, D.D.) April 25th, 1916.
212 Bishop of Peterborough (Right Rev. F. T. Woods, D.D.) September 21st, 1916.
213 Bishop of Kansas (Right Rev. J. Wise, D.D.) October 28th, 1916.
214 Bishop of Columbia (Right Rev. C. de V. Schofield, D.D.) November 30th, 1916.
215 Bishop (Missionary) of South Dakota (Right Rev. H. L. Burleson, D.D.) December 14th, 1916.
216 Bishop of Exeter (Right Rev. The Lord William Cecil, D.D.) December 28th, 1916.
217 Bishop of Ballarat (Right Rev. M. H. Maxwell-Gumbleton, D.D.) January 1st, 1917.
218 Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney (Right Rev. F. L. Deane, D.D.) May 1st, 1917.
219 Coadjutor Bishop of Capetown (Right Rev. J. O. Nash, D.D.) May 17th, 1917.
220 Bishop of Barbados (Right Rev. A. P. Berkeley, D.D.) August 12th, 1917.
221 Bishop of Honduras (British) (Right Rev. E. A. Dunn, D.D.) August 12th, 1917.
222 Bishop of Atlanta (Right Rev. H. J. Mikell, D.D.) November 1st, 1917.
223 Bishop of Gippsland (Right Rev. G. H. Cranswick, D.D.) November 1st, 1917.
224 Suffragan Bishop of South Dakota (Right Rev. W. P. Remington, D.D.) January 10th, 1918.
225 Bishop of Woolwich (Right Rev. W. W. Hough, D.D.) February 2nd, 1918.
226 Bishop of Newfoundland (Right Rev. W. C. White, D.D.) March 10th, 1918.
227 Bishop of Mombasa (Right Rev. R. S. Heywood, M.A.) April 21st, 1918.
228 Bishop in Fukien (Right Rev. J Hind, D.D.) October 18th, 1918.
229 Bishop of Warrington (Right Rev. M. Linton Smith, D.D.) November 1st, 1918.
230 Bishop of Worcester (Right Rev. E. H. Pearce, Litt.D.) February 24th, 1919.
231 Bishop of Cashel (Right Rev. R. Miller, D.D.) June 11th, 1919.
232 Bishop of the Falkland Isles (Right Rev. N. S. de Jersey, D.D.) June 24th, 1919.
233 Bishop of Nassau (Right Rev. R. G. Shedden, D.D.) June 24th, 1919.
234 Bishop of Barking (Right Rev. J. T. Inskip, D.D.) June 24th, 1919.
235 Bishop of Tasmania (Right Rev. R. S. Hay, D.D.) August 24th, 1919.
236 Bishop of Nebraska (Right Rev. E. V. Shayler, D.D.) September 11th, 1919.

237 Bishop of Truro (Right Rev. F. S. G. Warman, D.D.) October 18th, 1919.
238 Bishop of Southwark (Right Rev. C. F. Garbett, D.D.) October 18th, 1919.
239 Bishop of Stepney (Right Rev. H. Mosley, D.D.) October 18th, 1919.
240 Bishop of Lagos (Right Rev. F. Melville Jones, D.D.) October 18th, 1919.
241 Bishop in Persia (Right Rev. J. H. Linton, D.D.) October 18th, 1919.
242 Bishop of Down (Right Rev. C. T. P. Grierson, D.D.) October 28th, 1919.
243 Bishop of Kalgoorlie (Right Rev. W. E. Elsey, M.A.) November 9th, 1919.
244 Bishop of Lincoln (Right Rev. W. S. Swayne, D.D.) January 6th, 1920.
245 Bishop of Bendigo (Right Rev. D. Baker, D.D.) February 2nd, 1920.
246 Bishop of Bradford (Right Rev. A. W. T. Perowne, D.D.) February 2nd, 1920.
247 Bishop of Tuam (Right Rev. A. E. Ross, D.D.) February 24th, 1920.
248 Bishop of Pretoria (Right Rev. N. S. Talbot, D.D.) June 24th, 1920.
249 Bishop of Victoria, Hongkong (Right Rev. C. R. Duppuy, M.A.) June 24th, 1920.
250 Bishop of Lewes (Right Rev. H. K. Southwell, M.A.) June 24th, 1920.
251 Assistant Bishop of Western Equatorial Africa (Right Rev. A. W. Howells, M.A.) June 24th, 1920.
252 Bishop of Kampala (Right Rev. H. Gresford Jones, D.D.) June 24th, 1920.

LIST OF BISHOPS ATTENDING THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE OF 1920, ARRANGED ACCORDING TO PROVINCES.

Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Rev. R. T. Davidson, D.D.).
Bishop of Dover (Rt. Rev. H. E. Bilbrough, D.D.).
Bishop of Croydon (Rt. Rev. H. H. Pereira, D.D.).
Bishop of London (Rt. Rev. A. F. Winnington-Ingram, D.D.).
Bishop of Stepney (Rt. Rev. H. Mosley, D.D.).
Bishop of Kensington (Rt. Rev. J. P. Maud, D.D.).
Bishop of Willesden (Rt. Rev. W. W. Perrin, D.D.).
Bishop of Winchester (Rt. Rev. E. S. Talbot, D.D.).
Bishop of Southampton (Rt. Rev. J. Macarthur, D.D.).
Bishop of Guildford (Rt. Rev. J. H. G. Randolph, D.D.).
Assistant Bishop of Winchester (Rt. Rev. E. G. Ingham, D.D.).
Bishop of Bath and Wells (Rt. Rev. G. W. Kennion, D.D.).
Bishop of Taunton (Rt. Rev. C. F. De Salis, D.D.).
Assistant Bishop of Bath and Wells (Rt. Rev. W. H. Stirling, D.D.).
Bishop of Birmingham (Rt. Rev. H. R. Wakefield, D.D.).
Assistant Bishop of Birmingham (Rt. Rev. A. Hamilton Baynes, D.D.).
Bishop of Bristol (Rt. Rev. G. Nickson, D.D.).
Bishop of Chelmsford (Rt. Rev. J. E. Watts-Ditchfield, D.D.).
Bishop of Barking (Rt. Rev. J. T. Inskip, D.D.).
Bishop of Colchester (Rt. Rev. R. H. Whitcombe, D.D.).
Bishop of Chichester (Rt. Rev. W. O. Burrows, D.D.).
Bishop of Lewes (Rt. Rev. H. K. Southwell, M.A.).
Bishop of Coventry (Rt. Rev. H. W. Yeatman-Biggs, D.D.).
Bishop of Ely (Rt. Rev. F. H. Chase, D.D.).
Assistant Bishop of Ely (Rt. Rev. H. M. E. Price, D.D.).
Bishop of Exeter (Rt. Rev. Lord William Cecil, D.D.).
Bishop of Crediton (Rt. Rev. R. E. Trefusis, D.D.).
Bishop of Gloucester (Rt. Rev. E. C. S. Gibson, D.D.).
Bishop of Lichfield (Rt. Rev. J. A. Kempthorne, D.D.).
Bishop of Stafford (Rt. Rev. L. P. Crawfurd, D.D.).
Bishop of Lincoln (Rt. Rev. W. S. Swayne, D.D.).
Bishop of Grantham (Rt. Rev. J. E. Hine, D.D.).
Bishop of Norwich (Rt. Rev. B. Pollock, D.D.).
Bishop of Thetford (Rt. Rev. J. P. A. Bowers, D.D.).
Bishop of Oxford (Rt. Rev. H. M. Burge, D.D.).
Bishop of Buckingham (Rt. Rev. E. D. Shaw, D.D.).
Bishop of Peterborough (Rt. Rev. F. T. Woods, D.D.).
Bishop of Leicester (Rt. Rev. N. McL. Lang, D.D.).
Bishop of Rochester (Rt. Rev. J. R. Harmer, D.D.).
Bishop of St. Albans (Rt. Rev. M. B. Furse, D.D.).
Assistant Bishop of St. Albans (Rt. Rev. E. N. Hodges, D.D.).

Bishop of St. Edmundsbury and Ipswich (Rt. Rev. H. B. Hodgson, D.D.).
Bishop of Salisbury (Rt. Rev. F. E. Ridgeway, D.D.).
Assistant Bishop of Salisbury (Rt. Rev. A. E. Joscelyne, D.D.).
Bishop of Southwark (Rt. Rev. C. F. Garbett, D.D.).
Bishop of Kingston-on-Thames (Rt. Rev. S. M. Taylor, D.D.).
Bishop of Woolwich (Rt. Rev. W. W. Hough, D.D.).
Bishop of Southwell (Rt. Rev. E. Hoskyns, D.D.).
Bishop of Derby (Rt. Rev. C. T. Abraham, D.D.).
Bishop of Truro (Rt. Rev. F. S. G. Warman, D.D.).
Bishop of Worcester (Rt. Rev. E. H. Pearce, Litt.D.).
Rt. Rev. G. F. Browne, D.D.
Rt. Rev. R. S. Copleston, D.D.
Rt. Rev. G. L. King, D.D.
Rt. Rev. H. H. Montgomery, D.D.

Archbishop of York (Most Rev. C. G. Lang, D.D.).
Bishop of Beverley (Rt. Rev. R. J. Crosthwaite, D.D.).
Bishop of Hull (Rt. Rev. F. Gurdon, D.D.).
Bishop of Durham (Rt. Rev. H. Hensley Henson, D.D.).
Bishop of Jarrow (Rt. Rev. J. N. Quirk, D.D.).
Bishop of Bradford (Rt. Rev. A. W. T. Perowne, D.D.).
[Bishop of Carlisle]
Bishop of Barrow (Rt. Rev. C. West Watson, D.D.).
Bishop of Chester (Rt. Rev. H. L. Paget, D.D.).
Bishop of Liverpool (Rt. Rev. F. J. Chavasse, D.D.).
Bishop of Warrington (Rt. Rev. M. Linton Smith, D.D.).
Bishop of Manchester (Rt. Rev. E. A. Knox, D.D.).
Bishop of Burnley (Rt. Rev. H. Henn, D.D.).
Bishop of Whalley (Rt. Rev. A. G. Rawstorne, D.D.).
Bishop of Newcastle (Rt. Rev. H. L. Wild, D.D.).
[Bishop of Ripon]
Bishop of Knaresborough (Rt. Rev. L. F. M. B. Smith, D.D.).
Bishop of Richmond (Rt. Rev. F. C. Kilner, D.D.).
Bishop of Sheffield (Rt. Rev. L. H. Burrows, D.D.).
Bishop of Sodor and Man (Rt. Rev. J. Denton Thompson, D.D.).
Bishop of Wakefield (Rt. Rev. G. R. Eden, D.D.).

Archbishop of Armagh (Most Rev. C. F. D'Arcy, D.D.).
Bishop of Meath (Most Rev. B. J. Plunket, D.D.).
Bishop of Clogher (Rt. Rev. M. Day, D.D.).
Bishop of Derry and Raphoe (Rt. Rev J. I. Peacocke, D.D.).
Bishop of Down, Connor and Dromore (Rt. Rev. C. T. P. Grierson, D.D.).
Bishop of Kilmore, Elphin and Ardagh (Rt. Rev. W. R. Moore, D.D.).
Bishop of Tuam, Killala and Achonry (Rt. Rev. A. E. Ross, D.D.).

Bishop of Cashel, Emly, Waterford and Lismore (Rt. Rev. R Miller, D.D.).

Bishop of Cork, Cloyne and Ross (Rt. Rev. C. B. Dowse, D.D.).
Bishop of Ossory, Ferns and Leighlin (Rt. Rev. J. A. F. Gregg, D.D.).

Archbishop of Wales (Most Rev. E. G. Edwards, D.D.).
Bishop of Bangor (Rt. Rev. W. H. Williams, D.D.).
Bishop of Llandaff (Rt. Rev. J. P. Hughes, D.D.).
Assistant Bishop of Llandaff (Rt. Rev. O. T. L. Crossley. D.D.).
Bishop of St. Davids (Rt. Rev. J. Owen, D.D.).
Bishop of Swansea (Rt. Rev. E. L. Bevan, D.D.).

Bishop of Brechin, *Primus* (Most Rev. W. J. F. Robberds, D.D.)
Bishop of Aberdeen (Rt. Rev. F. L. Deane, D.D.).
Bishop of Argyll (Rt. Rev. K. Mackenzie, D.D.).
Bishop of Edinburgh (Rt. Rev. G. H. S. Walpole, D.D.).
Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway (Rt. Rev. A. E. Campbell, D.D.)
Bishop of Moray, Ross, and Caithness (Rt. Rev. A. J. Maclean, D.D.).
Bishop of St. Andrews, Dunkeld, and Dunblane (Rt. Rev. C. E. Plumb, D.D.).

Bishop of Calcutta, *Metropolitan* (Most Rev. F. Westcott, D.D.).
Bishop in Assam (Rt. Rev. H. Pakenham-Walsh, D.D.).
Bishop of Bombay (Rt. Rev. E. J. Palmer, D.D.).
Bishop of Colombo (Rt. Rev. E. A. Copleston, D.D.).
Bishop of Dornakal (Rt. Rev. V. S. Azariah, D.D.).
Bishop of Lucknow (Rt. Rev. G. H. Westcott, D.D.).
Bishop of Madras (Rt. Rev. H. Whitehead, D.D.).
Bishop of Nagpur (Rt. Rev. E. Chatterton, D.D.).
Bishop of Rangoon (Rt. Rev. R. S. Fyffe, D.D.).
Bishop in Tinnevelly and Madura (Rt. Rev. E. H. M. Waller, D.D.).

Archbishop of Capetown, *Metropolitan* (Most Rev. W. M. Carter, D.D.).
Coadjutor Bishop of Capetown (Rt. Rev. J. O. Nash, D.D.).
[Bishop of Bloemfontein.]
Assistant Bishop of Bloemfontein (Rt. Rev. F. R. T. Balfour, M.A.).
Bishop of George (Rt. Rev. H. B. Sidwell, D.D.).
Bishop of Grahamstown (Rt. Rev. F. R. Phelps, D.D.).
Bishop of Kimberley and Kuruman (Rt. Rev. W. Gore-Browne, M.A.).
Bishop of Natal (Rt. Rev. F. S. Baines, D.D.).
Assistant Bishop of Natal (Rt. Rev. F. Roach, D.D.).
Bishop of Pretoria (Rt. Rev. N. S. Talbot, D.D.).
Bishop of Southern Rhodesia (Rt. Rev. F. H. Beaven, D.D.).
Bishop of St. Helena (Rt. Rev. W. A. Holbech, D.D.).
Bishop of St. John's, Kaffraria (Rt. Rev. J. W. Williams, D.D.).
Bishop of Zululand (Rt. Rev. W. L. Vyvyan, D.D.).

Archbishop of Rupert's Land, *Primate and Metropolitan* (Most Rev. S. P. Matheson, D.D.).
Bishop of Athabasca (Rt. Rev. E. F. Robins, D.D.).
Bishop of Edmonton (Rt. Rev. H. A. Gray, D.D.).
Bishop of Honan (Rt. Rev. W. C. White, D.D.).
Bishop of Mackenzie River (Rt. Rev. J. R. Lucas, D.D.).
Bishop of Moosonee (Rt. Rev. J. G. Anderson, D.D.).
Bishop of Saskatchewan (Rt. Rev. J. A. Newnham, D.D.).

Archbishop of Nova Scotia, *Metropolitan* (Most Rev. C. L. Worrell, D.D.).
Bishop of Fredericton (Rt. Rev. J. A. Richardson, D.D.).
Bishop of Montreal (Rt. Rev. J. C. Farthing, D.D.).
Bishop of Quebec (Rt. Rev. L. W. Williams, D.D.).

Archbishop of Algoma, *Metropolitan* (Most Rev. G. Thorneloe, D.D.).
Bishop of Huron (Rt. Rev. D. Williams, D.D.).
Bishop of Ontario (Rt. Rev. E. J. Bidwell, D.D.).
Bishop of Ottawa (Rt. Rev. J. C. Roper, D.D.).
Bishop of Toronto (Rt. Rev. J. F. Sweeny, D.D.).

Bishop of Columbia (Rt. Rev. C. de V. Schofield, D.D.)
Bishop of Kootenay (Rt. Rev. A. J. Doull, D.D.).
Bishop of New Westminster (Rt. Rev. A. U. de Pencier, D.D.).

Archbishop of the West Indies and Bishop of Guiana, *Metropolitan* (Most Rev. E. A. Parry, D.D.).
Bishop of Antigua (Rt. Rev. E. Hutson, D.D.).
Bishop of Barbados (Rt. Rev. A. P. Berkeley, D.D.).
Bishop of Honduras, British (Rt. Rev. E. A. Dunn, D.D.).
Bishop of Jamaica (Rt. Rev. G. F. C. De Carteret, D.D.).
Bishop of Nassau (Rt. Rev. R. G. Shedden, D.D.).

Archbishop of Sydney, *Primate and Metropolitan* (Most Rev. J. C. Wright, D.D.).
Bishop of Adelaide (Rt. Rev. A. N. Thomas, D.D.).
Bishop of Goulburn (Rt. Rev. L. B. Radford, D.D.).
Bishop of Grafton (Rt. Rev. C. H. Druitt, D.D.).
Bishop of Newcastle (Rt. Rev. R. Stephen, D.D.).
Bishop of North-West Australia (Rt. Rev. G. Trower, D.D.).
Bishop of Riverina (Rt. Rev. E. A. Anderson, D.D.).
Bishop of Tasmania (Rt. Rev. R. S. Hay, D.D.).
Bishop of Willochra (Rt. Rev. G. White, D.D.).

Archbishop of Melbourne, *Metropolitan* (Most Rev. H. Lowther Clarke, D.D.).
Bishop of Ballarat (Rt. Rev. M. H. Maxwell-Gumbleton, D.D.).
Bishop of Bendigo (Rt. Rev. D. Baker, D.D.).
Bishop of Gippsland (Rt. Rev. G. H. Cranswick, D.D.).

Archbishop of Brisbane, *Metropolitan* (Most Rev. St. C. G. A. Donaldson, D.D.).
Bishop of Carpentaria (Rt. Rev. H. Newton, D.D.).
Bishop of New Guinea (Rt. Rev. G. Sharp, D.D.).
Bishop of North Queensland (Rt. Rev. J. O. Feetham, D.D.).
Bishop of Rockhampton (Rt. Rev. G. D. Halford, D.D.).

Bishop of Bunbury (Rt. Rev. C. Wilson, D.D.).
Bishop of Kalgoorlie (Rt. Rev. W. E. Elsey, M.A).

Bishop of Auckland (Rt. Rev. A. W. Averill, D.D.).
Bishop of Christchurch (Rt. Rev. C. Julius, D.D.).
Bishop of Waiapu (Rt. Rev. W. W. Sedgwick, D.D.).

Bishop of Accra (Rt. Rev. M. S. O'Rorke, D.D.).
Bishop in Argentina (Rt. Rev. E. F. Every, D.D.).
Bishop in Chekiang (Rt. Rev. H. J. Molony, D.D.)
Bishop in Corea (Rt. Rev. M. N. Trollope, D.D.).
Bishop of the Falkland Isles (Rt. Rev. N. S. de Jersey, D.D.
Bishop in Fukien (Rt. Rev. J. Hind, D.D.).
Bishop of Gibraltar (Rt. Rev. H. J. C. Knight, D.D.).
Bishop in Jerusalem (Rt. Rev. R. MacInnes, D.D.).
Bishop in Khartoum (Rt. Rev. Ll. H. Gwynne, D.D.).
Bishop in Kwangsi and Hunan (Rt. Rev. W. Banister, D.D.)
Bishop in Kyushu (Rt. Rev. A. Lea, D.D.).
Bishop of Lagos (Rt. Rev. F. Melville Jones, D.D.).
Assistant Bishop of Lagos (Rt. Rev. I. Oluwole, D.D.)
Bishop of Mombasa (Rt. Rev. R. S. Heywood, M.A.).
Bishop of Newfoundland (Rt. Rev. W. C. White, D.D.).
Bishop in North China (Rt. Rev. F. L. Norris, D.D.).
Bishop of Northern Rhodesia (Rt. Rev. A. J. W. May, D.D.).
Bishop of Nyasaland (Rt. Rev. T. C. Fisher, D.D.).
Bishop of Osaka (Rt. Rev. H. J. Foss, D.D.).
Bishop in Persia (Rt. Rev. J. H. Linton, D.D.).
Bishop in Polynesia (Rt. Rev. T. C. Twitchell, D.D.).
Assistant Bishop for Tonga (Rt. Rev. A. Willis, D.D.).
Bishop in Shantung (Rt. Rev. G. D. Iliff, D.D.).
Bishop of Sierra Leone (Rt. Rev. J. Walmsley, D.D.).
Bishop of Singapore (Rt. Rev. C. J. Ferguson-Davie, D.D.)
Bishop in South Tokyo (Rt. Rev. C. H. Boutflower, D.D.)
Bishop of Uganda (Rt. Rev. J. J. Willis, D.D.).
Bishop of Kampala (Rt. Rev. H. Gresford Jones, D.D.).
Bishop of Victoria, Hongkong (Rt. Rev. C. R. Duppuy, M.A.).
Bishop in Western China (Rt. Rev. W. W. Cassels, D.D.).
Assistant Bishop of Western Equatorial Africa (Rt. Rev. A. W. Howells, M.A.).
Bishop of Zanzibar (Rt. Rev. F. Weston, D.D.).

Bishop of Tennessee, *acting-Presiding Bishop* (Rt. Rev. T. F. Gailor, D.D.).
Bishop of Arizona (Rt. Rev. J. W. Atwood, D.D.).
Bishop of Asheville (Rt. Rev. J. M. Horner, D.D.).

Bishop of Atlanta (Rt. Rev. H. J. Mikell, D.D.).
Bishop of Bethlehem (Rt. Rev. E. Talbot, D.D.).
Bishop of Connecticut (Rt. Rev. C. B. Brewster, D.D.).
Bishop of Hankow (Rt. Rev. L. H. Roots, D.D.).
Bishop of Harrisburg (Rt. Rev. J. H. Darlington, D.D.).
Bishop of Kansas (Rt. Rev. J. Wise, D.D.).
Bishop of Long Island (Rt. Rev. F. Burgess, D.D.).
Bishop of Maine (Rt. Rev. B. Brewster, D.D.).
Bishop of Maryland (Rt. Rev. J. G. Murray, D.D.).
Bishop of Massachusetts (Rt. Rev. W. Lawrence, D.D.).
Bishop of Michigan (Rt. Rev. C. D. Williams, D.D.).
Bishop of Milwaukee (Rt. Rev. W. W. Webb, D.D.).
Bishop Coadjutor of Missouri (Rt. Rev. F. F. Johnson, D.D.).
Bishop of Nebraska (Rt. Rev. E. V. Shayler, D.D.).
Bishop of Newark (Rt. Rev. E. S. Lines, D.D.)
Coadjutor Bishop of Newark (Rt. Rev. W. R. Stearly, D.D.).
Bishop of New Jersey (Rt. Rev. P. Matthews, D.D.).
Bishop of New Mexico (Rt. Rev. F. B. Howden, D.D.).
Bishop of New York (Rt. Rev. C. S. Burch, D.D.).
Bishop of North Carolina (Rt. Rev. J. B. Cheshire, D.D.).
Bishop of North Texas (Rt. Rev. E. A. Temple, D.D.).
Bishop of Ohio (Rt. Rev. W. A. Leonard, D.D.).
Coadjutor Bishop of Ohio (Rt. Rev. F. Du Moulin, D.D.).
Bishop of Oklahoma (Rt. Rev. T. P. Thurston, D.D.).
Bishop of Olympia (Rt. Rev. F. W. Keator, D.D.).
Bishop of Pennsylvania (Rt. Rev. P. M. Rhinelander, D.D.).
Suffragan Bishop of Pennsylvania (Rt. Rev. T. J. Garland, D.D.).
Bishop of Rhode Island (Rt. Rev. J. D. Perry, D.D.).
Bishop of Sacramento (Rt. Rev. W. H. Moreland, D.D.).
Bishop of Southern Brazil (Rt. Rev. L. L. Kinsolving, D.D.).
Bishop of South Carolina (Rt. Rev. W. A. Guerry, D.D.).
Bishop of South Dakota (Rt. Rev. H. L. Burleson, D.D.).
Suffragan Bishop of South Dakota (Rt. Rev. W. P. Remington, D.D.).
Bishop of Southern Florida (Rt. Rev. C. Mann, D.D.).
Bishop of Southern Ohio (Rt. Rev. Boyd Vincent, D.D.)
Bishop of Texas (Rt. Rev. G. H. Kinsolving, D.D.).
Bishop of Tokyo (Rt. Rev. J. McKim, D.D.).
Bishop of Vermont (Rt. Rev. A. C. A. Hall, D.D.).
Bishop of Virginia (Rt. Rev. W. C. Brown, D.D.).
Bishop of Washington (Rt. Rev. A. Harding, D.D.).
Bishop of Western Massachusetts (Rt. Rev. T. F. Davies, D.D.)
Bishop of Western Michigan (Rt. Rev. J. N. McCormick, D.D.).
Bishop of West Missouri (Rt. Rev. S. C. Partridge, D.D.).
Bishop of Western Nebraska (Rt. Rev. G. A. Beecher, D.D.).
Bishop of Western New York (Rt. Rev. C. H. Brent, D.D.).
Bishop of West Virginia (Rt. Rev. W. L. Gravatt, D.D.).
Bishop of Wyoming (Rt. Rev. N. S. Thomas, D.D.)
Rt. Rev. E. W. Osborne, D.D.
Rt. Rev. G. Mott Williams, D.D.

ENCYCLICAL LETTER.

[NOTE.—*If it is desired to read this Encyclical Letter in the public services of the Church, it may be found convenient to divide it into two portions. For this purpose, the break should be made at page* 17, *after the words* " love to men."]

LETTER

TO THE FAITHFUL IN CHRIST JESUS,

We, Archbishops and Bishops of the Holy Catholic Church in full communion with the Church of England, two hundred and fifty-two in number, assembled from divers parts of the earth at Lambeth, under the presidency of the Archbishop of Canterbury, in the year of our Lord 1920, within two years of the ending of the Great War, give you greeting in the name of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ.

We who speak are bearers of the sacred commission of the Ministry given by our Lord through His Apostles to the Church. In His Name we desire to set forth before you the outcome of the grave deliberations to which, after solemn prayer and Eucharist, we have for five weeks devoted ourselves day by day. We take this opportunity of thanking from our hearts all those, both far and near, who have prayed God to give us His Spirit's present aid. We hope that the results of our work may bring encouragement and help to this great circle of intercessors, even in remote parts of the earth. Our deliberations were preceded by careful inquiry upon many sides into the matters about which we speak. In this Letter we propose to give a connected view of these matters, in the hope that it will make our Resolutions more intelligible, and lead some to study them, together with the Reports of our Committees on which they are based.

We find that one idea runs through all our work in this Conference, binding it together into a true unity. It is an idea prevalent and potent throughout the world to-day. It is the idea of Fellowship.

The minds and the hearts of men already go out to this idea. Men never prized the universal fellowship of mankind as they did when the Great War had for the time destroyed it. For four terrible years the loss of international fellowship emphasized its value. But the war which broke one fellowship created others. Nations became associated in alliances, which they cemented with their blood. In every national army, comradeship, novel and intense, united men of different classes and most various traditions. Thousands gained quite a new impression of what human nature might be, when they experienced the fellowship of man with man in danger and death.

Comradeship ennobled war. To-day men are asking, Can it not ennoble peace?

But the power of fellowship was prominent even before the war. Through trade-unions and other societies it had changed the face of industrial life. It bound together workers in science, education, and social reform. It gave its character to our recreations. In these and many other phenomena of the times, there is the same motive taking different forms, the desire for fuller and freer life, and there is the same conviction that it is to be gained by effort in fellowship.

To a world that craves for fellowship we present our message. The secret of life is fellowship. So men feel, and it is true. But fellowship with God is the indispensable condition of human fellowship. The secret of life is the double fellowship, fellowship with God and with men.

This cardinal truth was emphasized by our Lord in words which can never grow old, when He said: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind. This is the great and first commandment." It can never yield the primacy to the second, which is like unto it: "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." For that primacy belongs to the order of creation. God made man in His own image, and God is love.

Men to-day are tempted to despair of the world and to blame its design. But this at least we can say: the life of men upon earth was designed to give opportunities for love and nothing has defeated that design. Those things which most perplex us, suffering and sin, have been the occasion of the most conspicuous triumphs of love. This design is the clue to the labyrinth of life. We lose our way in the maze whenever we let go this clue.

Men lost the clue and they are always losing it, for they will not keep God in their knowledge, nor love in their hearts. It is ours to recall men to God and to His revealed purposes and His acts which reveal them. It is ours to bid them pause in the hurry and stress of life, in the midst of its trivialities and its tragedy, and contemplate anew the ways of God. He made men for love, that they might love Him and love one another. They rejected His purpose, but He did not abandon it. He chose a nation, and made it in a special sense His own, that within it love of God and men might be cultivated, and that thus it might enlighten the world. Into that nation He sent forth His Son, both to reconcile the world to Himself and to reconcile men one to another. And His Son formed a new and greater Israel, which we call the Church, to carry on His own mission of reconciling men to God and men to men. The foundation and ground of all fellowship is the undeflected will of God, renewing again and again its patient effort to possess, without

destroying, the wills of men. And so He has called into being a fellowship of men, His Church, and sent His Holy Spirit to abide therein, that by the prevailing attraction of that one Spirit, He, the one God and Father of all, may win over the whole human family to that fellowship in Himself, by which alone it can attain to the fulness of life.

This then is the object of the Church. In the prosecution of this object it must take account of every fellowship that exists among men, must seek to deepen and purify it, and, above all, to attach it to God. But in order to accomplish its object, the Church must itself be a pattern of fellowship. It is only by shewing the value and power of fellowship in itself that it can win the world to fellowship. The weakness of the Church in the world of to-day is not surprising when we consider how the bands of its own fellowship are loosened and broken.

Reunion of Christendom.

The truth of this had been slowly working into the consciousness of Christians before the war. But the war and its horrors, waged as it was between so-called Christian nations, drove home the truth with the shock of a sudden awakening. Men in all Communions began to think of the reunion of Christendom, not as a laudable ambition or a beautiful dream, but as an imperative necessity. Proposals and counter-proposals were made, some old, some new. Mutual recognition, organic union, federation, absorption, submission—these phrases indicate the variety of the programmes put forward. Some definite proposals came from the Mission Field, where the urgency of the work of evangelization and the birth of national Churches alike demand a new fellowship. Again, in the shadow of suffering and in the light of sympathy, the ancient Churches of the East drew nearer to our own than ever before. An official delegation from the Oecumenical Patriarchate came to London, at the time of our Conference, to confer with our Committee on the points which still need mutual explanation between our two Churches. The preparations for the World Conference on Faith and Order had not only drawn attention in all parts of the world to Christian unity, but had led to discussions in many quarters which brought to light unsuspected agreement between the leaders of different Communions. The great wind was blowing over the whole earth.

Such were the conditions of the time at which our Conference met. All realized that the subject of reunion was our most important subject. The Bishops brought with them, into the Conference, very various preconceptions. Different traditions, different estimates of history, different experiences in the present, different opinions on current proposals, seemed almost to preclude the hope of reaching any common mind. The subject of Reunion was entrusted to the largest Committee ever appointed in a

Lambeth Conference. As their work proceeded, the members of it felt that they were being drawn by a Power greater than themselves to a general agreement. Their conclusions were accepted by the Conference under the same sense of a compelling influence. The decision of the Conference was reached with a unanimity all but complete. It is embodied in our Appeal to all Christian people.

In this Appeal we urge them to try a new approach to reunion; to adopt a new point of view; to look up to the reality as it is in God. The unity which we seek exists. It is in God, Who is the perfection of unity, the one Father, the one Lord, the one Spirit, Who gives life to the one Body. Again, the one Body exists. It needs not to be made, nor to be remade, but to become organic and visible. Once more, the fellowship of the members of the one Body exists. It is the work of God, not of man. We have only to discover it, and to set free its activities.

Thus our appeal is in idea and in method a new appeal. If it be prospered, it will change the spirit and direction of our efforts. Terms of reunion must no longer be judged by the success with which they meet the claims and preserve the positions of two or more uniting Communions, but by their correspondence to the common ideal of the Church as God would have it to be. Again, in the past, negotiations for reunion have often started with the attempt to define the measure of uniformity which is essential. The impression has been given that nothing else matters. Now we see that those elements of truth about which differences have arisen are essential to the fulness of the witness of the whole Church. We have no need to belittle what is distinctive in our own interpretation of Christian life: we believe that it is something precious which we hold in trust for the common good. We desire that others should share in our heritage and our blessings, as we wish to share in theirs. It is not by reducing the different groups of Christians to uniformity, but by rightly using their diversity, that the Church can become all things to all men. So long as there is vital connexion with the Head, there is positive value in the differentiation of the members. But we are convinced that this ideal cannot be fulfilled if these groups are content to remain in separation from one another or to be joined together only in some vague federation. Their value for the fulness of Christian life, truth, and witness can only be realised if they are united in the fellowship of one visible society whose members are bound together by the ties of a common faith, common sacraments, and a common ministry. It is towards this ideal of a united and truly Catholic Church that we must all set our minds.

This truer conception of the Church and of the Divine purpose disclosed in its history must regulate our aspirations as well as our endeavours. We cannot suppose, indeed, that we have found

a way to solve all difficulties in a moment. The vision must become clear to the general body of Christian men and women, and this will take time. We must all direct our gaze towards it. We must help one another to see what steps lead towards its fulfilment, and what steps lead the other way. The vision points the road to reunion. That road may not be short, but, we believe, it will be sure.

The Anglican Communion.

The more our minds are filled with the hopes of seeing the universal fellowship in full and free activity, the more zealous ought we to be to improve and strengthen in every way the fellowship of our own Church. This is one of the most direct and obvious methods of preparing for reunion.

In our Resolutions we call upon each Church of our Communion to develop its constitutional self-government and to give more and better opportunities for service to all its members. The wider and deeper, the more complete and the more effective is the life of any one Church, the more points of contact will it find with others. We would also communicate to the Churches of our Communion an impression which has forced itself upon us on many occasions in our discussions. Because our Church has spread over the world, and still more because we desire to enter into the world-wide fellowship of a reunited universal Church, we must begin now to clear ourselves of local, sectional, and temporary prepossessions, and cultivate a sense of what is universal and genuinely Catholic, in truth and in life. Our Conferences give us the opportunity of comparing the experience which we have gained in matters of organization, and of bringing together and recording the results for the information of the whole Communion. In this connexion we may mention that at the present meeting we adopted a series of somewhat technical resolutions dealing with the formation of new Provinces and the constitution of the Central Consultative Body. The subject of the Provinces, though important, we will pass over here. The Central Consultative Body acts, in a certain limited way, for the Lambeth Conference in the intervals between its meetings. It is thus one of the links which bind together our fellowship. The characteristics of that fellowship are well worth attention when the reunion of the world-wide Church is in men's thoughts. The fact that the Anglican Communion has become world-wide forces upon it some of the problems which must always beset the unity of the Catholic Church itself. Perhaps, as we ourselves are dealing with these problems, the way will appear in which the future reunited Church must deal with them.

For half a century the Lambeth Conference has more and more served to focus the experience and counsels of our Communion.

But it does not claim to exercise any powers of control or command. It stands for the far more spiritual and more Christian principle of loyalty to the fellowship. The Churches represented in it are indeed independent, but independent with the Christian freedom which recognizes the restraints of truth and of love. They are not free to deny the truth. They are not free to ignore the fellowship. And the objects of our Conferences are to attain an ever deeper apprehension of the truth, and to guard the fellowship with ever increasing appreciation of its value. If the Conference is to attain such objects, it must be because it is itself a fellowship in the Spirit.

The Ministry of Women.

The duty of preserving and strengthening the fellowship of the Church belongs specially to a smaller fellowship within it, the fellowship of the ordained ministry. The three Orders of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons have always been assisted in their ministry by many others who at different times and in different places have had different names and positions. In a wider and more general sense these all belong to the ministry of the Church; for the special kinds of service which they have to do distinguish them from the main body of Christians, who are commanded in general terms " by love to serve one another." Thus the great fellowship is throughout cemented by service, which is love in action.

There has been much discussion of late about the admission of women to share in the ministry of the Church, both in the wider and in the narrower sense of those words; and the Church must frankly acknowledge that it has under-valued and neglected the gifts of women and has too thanklessly used their work. We have thought well to give in a series of Resolutions what we think to be the general mind of our branch of the Catholic Church at this time about this subject. We feel bound to respect the customs of the Church, not as an iron law, but as results and records of the Spirit's guidance. In such customs there is much which obviously was dictated by reasonable regard to contemporary social conventions. As these differ from age to age and country to country, the use which the Church makes of the service of women will also differ. But this use will be further determined by a more important consideration. It is the peculiar gifts and the special excellences of women which the Church will most wish to use. Its wisdom will be shewn, not in disregarding, but in taking advantage of, the differences between women and men. These considerations seem to have guided the primitive Church to create the Order of Deaconesses. We have recorded our approval of the revival of that Order, and we have attempted to indicate the duties and functions which in our judgement belong to it. We also recognize that God has granted to some

women special gifts of spiritual insight and powers of prophetic teaching. We have tried to shew how these gifts can be exercised to the greatest benefit of the Church. The arrangements which we have suggested are not applicable to all countries alike. Yet everywhere the attempt must be made to make room for the Spirit to work, according to the wisdom which He will give, so that the fellowship of the Ministry may be strengthened by the co-operation of women and the fellowship of the Church be enriched by their spiritual gifts.

Some Movements Outside the Church.

There is much that the fellowship of the Church lacks for its completeness of life. As a fellowship with God and in God, it has infinite resources of power on which to draw. But the tendency to say " the old is good " is particularly strong in the Church. Religious people are apt to feel the goodness of the old so much that they are slow to prove whether there are yet powers of God on which they have never drawn. They are almost equally slow to believe that they might themselves receive the blessings which were given to faith in its primitive freshness. As a result of this, sometimes men and women form fellowships that they may do outside the Church what they ought to have had opportunity to do, and to do better, within it.

One of our committees has dealt with the Christian Faith in relation to Spiritualism, Christian Science, and Theosophy. We commend its Report to all who are interested in these movements. In it the teachings which are connected with them are tested in the light of Christian truth. Tried by the doctrines of the Incarnation and the Cross, they are clearly shewn to involve serious error. It is also shewn that adherents of these movements are drawn into practices and cults which injure their spiritual life, and endanger their loyalty to Christ and to the fellowship of His Church. On the other hand, it must not be forgotten that these movements are very largely symptoms and results of reaction against materialistic views of life. We cannot but sympathize with persons who seek a refuge from the pressure of materialism. It is the part of the Church to afford such a refuge, and, if it fails to do so, there is something wrong with its own life.

There is much in Christian Science which ought to be found within the Church, where it would be supplemented by truths which in Christian Science are neglected. For instance, Church people receive, and must always receive, with all thankfulness, as from God, the help which medical skill and devotion can give. But on the other hand they ought to take more account of the recent growth of knowledge about the power of spirit and mind over body. More than this, they ought to display an intenser faith in their Lord Himself as the source of all healing, bodily

and spiritual, and to have bolder expectations of His willingness to respond to their prayers with gracious revelations of His power. They ought to offer far more numerous examples of that repose upon God which is the health of the soul, and secures, in ways which pass understanding, the health of the body. For all these things are the rightful heritage of those who abide in the Divine fellowship.

Religion has promises which we have not fully claimed, not only of the life which now is, but also of the life which is to come. Our fellowship with one another, not less than our fellowship with God, triumphs over death. We who belong to the Church's lesser fellowship in this world are not separated from, but are one with, those who belong to the Church's higher fellowship in the other world. This is, in part, what we mean by the Communion or Fellowship of Saints. The distance between our temporary and our permanent home, between earth and heaven, is not great. Christ and His Apostles made this clear, and the Christian experience of centuries has confirmed it. Belief in this reality and the nearness of the other world has been deepened by the war. The bereaved heart of mankind with earnest, if not always wise, endeavour is straining to bridge the space that lies between. It is in this endeavour that many distracted souls turn to spiritualism for help, not realizing that the Church has abundant treasures of comfort, and assurance of the world beyond this, with which to bring to the sorrowing the solace which is the right and the heritage of Christians. It is for the commissioned teachers of the Church so to present the Communion of Saints as to make it a satisfying force in the life of mourners. Whatever new triumphs of faith remain to be achieved and whatever new voices of comfort are waiting or utterance, the bond of love, rightly understood, will continue to be strong enough to carry the bereaved through the days of mourning and the discipline of separation till the day breaks and the shadows flee. Here, as in all fellowship, there are silences and limitations which cannot be wholly done away while earth lasts. But through them and beyond them fellowship abides.

Fellowship in this life, whether with God or with one another, is but the preliminary stage in an eternal progress. While the spiritualist seeks light upon the future life through communication with the departed, the theosophist seeks the clue to his own destiny in the mysteries of his own being. Here again the Christian faith gives us all that we need for life and work. That faith bids us look onward from glory to glory, in the ever closer union of the spirit of man with the Christ who is God and was made man, and not merely in the evolution of a Christ within, who is but the higher self of man. Here again fellowship is the path and the goal. The hidden man of the

heart, who is now being fashioned by the one Spirit after the likeness of the one Christ, is no lonely seeker after truth, no disciple of an esoteric brotherhood, but a citizen of a spiritual kingdom in which all sorts and conditions of men in every race and nation are being trained to feel the power of God and to fulfil the purpose of God for the whole world.

We have spoken of the Church and of those things which it lacks. If it is to be a perfect fellowship, as it ought to be, it must recover them, especially unity and power. We would end this section of our Letter by pleading earnestly with Church people to use the only means by which the Church can regain those great gifts. The first is prayer. Pray without ceasing, without wavering, faithfully, instantly, fervently. Prayer is the source of all our strength. The second is to obey the Lord's command, and more earnestly and more devoutly to partake of the Sacrament of His Body and Blood. In it offer yourselves with your souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice in union with His Sacrifice. In it learn from Him the way of fellowship, with God and with man, and receive in Him the power to share His love to His Father and His love to men.

Marriage and the Family.

From the fellowship of the Church, what it ought to be and what it ought to contain, we now pass to other fellowships which exist among men by the will of God. For these fellowships too there is only one inspiration, and that is the Spirit of God. The Church, in which it has pleased God to dwell by His Spirit, ought therefore to have a message for all these fellowships.

The fellowship between man and woman in marriage was the earliest which God gave to the human race. "From the beginning of the creation," as our Lord reminded us, God made them male and female. What our Lord adds about marriage is not given as new legislation, but as a declaration of God's original purpose. The man and his wife are no longer twain, but one flesh: and those whom God has joined together, man is not to put asunder. This revelation about God's purpose gives the keynote to all that the Church has to teach about marriage. Because it can found its teaching upon the will and act of God in making the union, the Church can go on to teach how God will complete it. He will work, as those who wait for Him well know, the miracle by which the two lives become one, yet so that each life becomes greater and better than it could have been alone. But marriage is not ordained only to give opportunity for the development of those two lives in unity. It has essentially the aim of bringing other lives into the world. Its indissolubility should secure to the children the continued care and love of both their parents, so long as they live. The State's obvious interest in the children should lead it to preserve

the strictness of marriage law. On the other hand it is the purpose of God for themselves and for their children that Christian parents should regard. On the fellowship begun in their union and widened into the fellowship of their home, they will build up their nation according to the purpose of God; and not only the nation but also the Church; for He, after Whom the carpenter's household will ever be called the Holy Family, wills to build every generation of His Church on holy families.

We cannot forget how He Who was the centre of the Holy Family became afterwards the succourer and saviour of some of those who had strayed furthest away from the sanctities of home. He raises up in His Church from age to age compassionate spirits, who by His aid follow the example of His winning compassion. Our Committee has touched upon this part of the Church's work, and urged the great need that is now felt for more helpers in it. We note with interest how the spirit of fellowship is stirring here also, and how it is now agreed that the love and brightness of comradeship should surround those unhappy ones as they retrace their steps to a truer life.

Industry and Commerce.

The relation of men one to another in industry or trade is another fellowship which God intended to exist and created to be good. Yet to-day we are confronted with a world-wide upheaval and embittered antagonism in social relations, the course of which none can foresee. We seem to be involved in an internecine conflict between capital and labour in which each aims at an exclusive supremacy. Any such supremacy would be inconsistent with the Christian ideal of fellowship. And the Church insists that, in its essential nature, industry is not a conflict, but a fellowship. Again, every trade or profession ought to be producing something which men want and ought to want; and so far each is doing service to the community. But in industrial life all such service depends on combined effort. It is rendered in co-operation. The message of Christianity in this matter is to make men see that here they can and must "in love serve one another." To all concerned, employer and employed, director and workman, investor of money and investor of brain or muscle—to all alike the Church must say: "Put first your service to the community and your fellowship in that service. Do your work heartily, keenly, carefully as to God, because you are benefiting His children. Have good will, and expect others to have it. Rearrange your mutual relations, as men co-operating in fellowship, not competing in suspicion and hostility." These are fundamental principles. Beyond them lies the whole region of practical application. In the technical side of economics, which is a science for experts,

the Church has no authority. But whenever in the working out of economic or of political theory moral issues are directly involved, the Church has a duty to see that the requirements of righteousness are faced and fairly met. The Church will, for instance, maintain that fellowship is endangered if all who serve do not share equitably in the results of labour. For this is part of Christian justice. The Church will fearlessly claim that the human character of every worker is more sacred than his work; that his worth as a child of God and member of the fellowship must not be forgotten, or imperilled by any form of industrial slavery. For this belongs to the spirit of Christian liberty. In all such things the Church will, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, proclaim its message of brotherhood and mutual service, founded on the Divine purpose for men, and will aid the community in giving active expression to it. But our hope throughout is in the Spirit of God. In no other way, as we believe, can society recover itself than by recovering the plan of God for its well-being, and by reliance on His inspiration for realizing that plan. Such are the principles and thoughts which underlie our Resolutions on Industrial and Social Problems.

International Relations.

We pass on to the relation between nations. We cannot believe that the effect of the coming of the Kingdom of God upon earth will be to abolish nations. Holy Scripture emphasizes the value of national life and indicates its permanence. The sense of nationality seems to be a natural instinct. The love which Christ pours into the hearts that are His, makes men cease to hate each other because they belong to different nations. Within redeemed humanity nations will not cease to exist, but nationality itself will be redeemed. We need not despair of this consummation because of any wrongs which have been done in the name of nationality, however recent and however appalling.

Thus the purpose of God for the nations, as we conceive it, is that they should form a fellowship, as of a brotherhood or a family. They are intended, as nations, by love to serve one another. They are intended to develop distinctive gifts and characters, and to contribute them to the common good. There is no place in this ideal for jealousy or hatred, for ruthless competition, and for the ambition to conquer and to enslave. Nor does the imposition of peace upon the world by fear of the strong arm bring this ideal much nearer. For this ideal is essentially an ideal of freedom, the freedom of brothers in a family, wherein the immature and the weak have carefully secured to them the chance to grow and to grow strong.

We commend to all Christian people the principles which underlie the League of Nations, the most promising and the most systematic attempt to advance towards the ideal of the family

of nations which has ever been projected. It has deeply stirred the hopes of those who long for peace on earth and increase of fellowship. But if any such League is to have success it will need the enthusiastic and intelligent support of millions of men and women. It is not enough that Governments should agree to it, or statesmen work for it. The hearts and minds of the people in all countries must be behind it. In all nations a great change is needed, and is needed now. War-weariness cannot unite and is not uniting us. Neither the sufferings of some countries nor the ambitions of others are making much impression on a paralysed world. The world needs to recover feeling, but the feeling must be right and true. Before either peace or freedom can be established in security and joy, the fires of brother-love must leap up in the hearts of the nations. This great change requires a miracle, but it is a change that can be wrought by the one Spirit of fellowship, which is the Spirit of God. We must subject our wills and open our hearts to His influence, that He may work that miracle in the world.

Missionary Problems.

It will be naturally and rightly said that the great ideal of the brotherhood of nations involves for its full realization the thorough permeation of the nations with Christ's Spirit. The conversion of the nations is the only real hope for the world.

It is a curious coincidence that all the most prominent problems in the Mission Field to-day are in some way connected with nationality. The Report of our Committee traverses the whole ground. We would here indicate only the salient points.

"These that have turned the world upside down are come hither also." Many others besides the men of Thessalonica have recognized that Christianity is a revolutionary force. It cannot be otherwise. The preaching of the Kingdom of God is always, as it was at the first, also the preaching of a change of mind. It is certain to make people see that "the manner of life handed down from their fathers" is in some, or perhaps many, respects "vain." Whether missionaries emphasize this, or leave it to be inferred, they are sure to incur suspicion and arouse resentment. But to-day they are coming to see that some of this suspicion and resentment is due to their own faulty conception of their object.

They have been content to make disciples out of all the nations. They have not remembered that their Master in fact commanded them to make all the nations His disciples. In other words they have not taken due account of the value of nationality. The aim of missions is not only to make Christians, but to make Christian nations. The principle has consequences, both negative and positive, which are daily becoming clearer. No community

of Christians has a right to attempt to produce a replica of itself in a foreign country which it evangelizes. Neither forms of worship, nor methods of thought, nor social institutions belonging to one race ought to be imposed on another. Nor will evangelism or pastorate for longer than necessary be retained in foreign hands.

Foreign missionaries should set before themselves one ideal, and one only: to plant the Catholic Church in every land. They must remember that the Catholic Church needs the fulness of the nations. They must long to see national life putting on Christ, and national thought interpreting His truth. The more they have valued their own nationality, the more they should respect the nationality of others. They do not go out to obliterate other men's nationality, but to bring it near to Christ Who can exalt and complete it. They do not go out to propagate their national Church, but to add another national Church to the Church Catholic. They carry with them warnings and lessons from the history of national Churches. They will be on their guard against that sectarian spirit which is the danger of national isolation. No foreigner can forecast, still less invent, the lines of national development in religion. The foreign missionary therefore must give his strength to making known Christ in the fulness of His Person, His work, and His revelation of the Father, together with the great inheritance of Catholic tradition and the glory of the fellowship of the Catholic Church. He must leave to the converts the task of finding out their national response to the revelation of God in Christ, and their national way of walking in the fellowship of the Saints by the help of the One Spirit. Thus will the glory of the nations be brought into the Holy City.

But not only does the Church need every nation to be evangelized. It needs also the help of every nation in evangelization. It has been a consequence of the late war that missionaries of certain nations are forbidden to work in the greater part of the world. As Christians, we cannot acquiesce in this prohibition, except as a temporary measure. The command of Christ is obligatory on those nations, as on our own. Nor can the missionary cause afford to lose their assistance. But if this claim, which we thus advance in the Name of Christ, is to command the attention of statesmen, the standard of missionary single-mindedness must be kept very high. No one can be a politician as well as a missionary, without endangering the credit of Christian Missions as a whole. If missions are not to be at the mercy of measures of political expediency, missionaries must be plainly seen to have no object or motive, no thought beyond the spreading of the Kingdom of God.

We have devoted so much space to the relation of nations and the national spirit to missions, because that is the out-

standing problem of the Mission Field to-day. But we would not be misunderstood. Each of us belongs by his birth to some one of the many nations of the world. But every Christian belongs by his second birth to one holy nation, which is God's own possession. When loyalty to his own nation comes into conflict with loyalty to that holy nation of which Christ is King, a Christian can have no doubt which loyalty must give way. "He that loveth father and mother more than me," said Jesus Christ, "is not worthy of me." National loyalty has often led men into exclusiveness, jealousy and hatred, which are far from Christ's purpose. No selfishness in the world has been so persistent or so ruthless as national selfishness. It is to save men from such wickedness that Jesus Christ binds them together into one holy nation. In the fellowship of this great unity nationality finds its redemption: while national characteristics are preserved for noble use and mutual benefit. But the love of God encompasses all and reconciles both men and nations in the brotherhood of redeemed humanity.

Conclusion. To a world full of trouble and perplexity, of fear and despair, of disconnected effort and aimless exertion, we present what we have been permitted to see of the purpose of God. It is enough to guide us. But, if it often seems that the message of religion is too general and its application to details too difficult, then it is our duty to recall to ourselves that we have to do, not with a theory, but with a Person. God is working His purpose out. If in simplicity we give ourselves to Him, He will work with us beyond our understanding: and we shall have contributed to the fellowship of man, because we have been working in fellowship with God.

Signed on behalf of the Conference,

RANDALL CANTUAR:

THEODORE PETRIBURG:
H. H. MONTGOMERY (Bishop) } *Secretaries.*

G. K. A. BELL, *Assistant Secretary.*

August 7th, 1920.

NOTE.

It may be well to make clear the manner of our deliberations. The subjects proposed for consideration were first brought before us in Sessions of the whole Conference, lasting for six full days, from Monday, July 5th to Saturday, July 10th. Having been there set forth in outline,

they were then referred to large and carefully chosen Committees; and the Reports of these Committees, with the Resolutions which they had prepared, were subsequently laid before the Conference, meeting again to consider them in full session from Monday, July 26th, to Saturday, August 7th. By this procedure we have been able to secure both the detailed study which is the especial task of a Committee (a study greatly aided by the essays, Reports and papers which had been prepared for us), and that weight of judgement which belongs to the decisions of an assembly gathered from all parts of the world and bringing to the process of deliberation the manifold experience and knowledge acquired under widely different conditions in widely sundered fields of labour.

The judgement of the Conference is expressed in the Resolutions, eighty in number, appended to this Letter. These, and these alone, are affirmed by the Conference. The Reports, which are also printed herewith, have been received by the Conference; and the Conference has directed that they should be published; but the responsibility for the statements and opinions which they contain rests with the several Committees by whom they were prepared.

RESOLUTIONS* FORMALLY ADOPTED BY THE CONFERENCE OF 1920.

Christianity and International Relations.

1. We rejoice that in these times of peril God is giving to His Church a fresh vision of His purpose to establish a Kingdom in which all the nations of the earth shall be united as one family in righteousness and peace. We hold that this can only come through the acceptance of the sovereignty of our Lord Jesus Christ and of His teaching, and through the application of the principles of brotherhood, justice, and unselfishness, to individuals and nations alike.

2. The Conference calls upon the citizens of all nations to promote in every way the resumption of the efforts, interrupted by the War, to increase international comity and goodwill, and to secure expression for these by an increased recognition of international law and custom.

3. The Conference, heartily endorsing the views of its Committee as to the essentially Christian basis of the League of Nations, is of opinion that steps should immediately be taken, whether by co-operation or concurrent action, whereby the whole Church of Christ may be enabled with one voice to urge the principles of the League of Nations upon the peoples of the world.

4. We hold that the peace of the world, no less than Christian principle, demands the admission of Germany and other nations into the League of Nations at the earliest moment which the conditions render possible.

5. The Conference commends the Report of its Committee on International Relations to the careful consideration of the Churches of the Anglican Communion, both in their Assemblies and in other ways, and urges upon all Church members the importance of supporting the League of Nations Union.

* In these Resolutions as printed in the first edition of the Report there were two mistakes: (*a*) the proviso in the first paragraph of Resolution 12 was accidentally omitted; (*b*) the word "relieving" in Resolution 62 was accidentally printed as "removing."

6. It is the duty of all supporters of the League of Nations to set their face against injustice to the indigenous or native races, and particularly in regard to such matters as the tenure of land, forced labour, and the trade in intoxicating liquors, and also the morphia traffic in China, and other abuses.

7. The Conference records its protest against the colour-prejudice among the different races of the world, which not only hinders intercourse, but gravely imperils the peace of the future.

8. The Conference, believing that nations no less than individuals are members one of another, expresses its grave concern at the evidence as to the disease and distress from which the populations in large tracts of Europe and Asia are suffering. It therefore calls upon all Christian men and women to support by every means in their power the action which is being taken, both by Governments and by voluntary associations, for the relief of this suffering.

Reunion of Christendom.

9. The Conference adopts and sends forth the following Appeal to all Christian people:

AN APPEAL TO ALL CHRISTIAN PEOPLE

From the Bishops assembled in the Lambeth Conference of 1920.

We, Archbishops, Bishops Metropolitan, and other Bishops of the Holy Catholic Church in full communion with the Church of England, in Conference assembled, realizing the responsibility which rests upon us at this time, and sensible of the sympathy and the prayers of many, both within and without our own Communion, make this appeal to all Christian people.

We acknowledge all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, and have been baptized into the name of the Holy Trinity, as sharing with us membership in the universal Church of Christ which is His Body. We believe that the Holy Spirit has called us in a very solemn and special manner to associate ourselves in penitence and prayer with all those who deplore the divisions of Christian people, and are inspired by the vision and hope of a visible unity of the whole Church.

I. We believe that God wills fellowship. By God's own act this fellowship was made in and through Jesus Christ, and its life is in His Spirit. We believe that it is God's purpose to manifest this fellowship, so far as this world is concerned, in an outward, visible, and united society, holding one faith, having its own recognized officers, using God-given means of grace, and inspiring all its members to the world-wide service of the Kingdom of God. This is what we mean by the Catholic Church.

II. This united fellowship is not visible in the world to-day. On the one hand there are other ancient episcopal Communions in East and West, to whom ours is bound by many ties of common faith and tradition. On the other hand there are the great non-episcopal Communions, standing for rich elements of truth, liberty and life which might otherwise have been obscured or neglected. With them we are closely linked by many affinities, racial, historical and spiritual. We cherish the earnest hope that all these Communions, and our own, may be led by the Spirit into the unity of the Faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God. But in fact we are all organized in different groups, each one keeping to itself gifts that rightly belong to the whole fellowship, and tending to live its own life apart from the rest.

III. The causes of division lie deep in the past, and are by no means simple or wholly blameworthy. Yet none can doubt that self-will, ambition, and lack of charity among Christians have been principal factors in the mingled process, and that these, together with blindness to the sin of disunion, are still mainly responsible for the breaches of Christendom. We acknowledge this condition of broken fellowship to be contrary to God's will, and we desire frankly to confess our share in the guilt of thus crippling the Body of Christ and hindering the activity of His Spirit.

IV. The times call us to a new outlook and new measures. The Faith cannot be adequately apprehended and the battle of the Kingdom cannot be worthily fought while the body is divided, and is thus unable to grow up into the fulness of the life of Christ. The time has come, we believe, for all the separated groups of Christians to agree in forgetting the things which are behind and reaching out towards the goal of a reunited Catholic Church. The removal of the barriers which have arisen between them will only be brought about by a new comradeship of those whose faces are definitely set this way.

The vision which rises before us is that of a Church, genuinely Catholic, loyal to all Truth, and gathering into its fellowship all "who profess and call themselves Christians," within whose visible unity all the treasures of faith and order, bequeathed as a heritage by the past to the present, shall be

possessed in common, and made serviceable to the whole Body of Christ. Within this unity Christian Communions now separated from one another would retain much that has long been distinctive in their methods of worship and service. It is through a rich diversity of life and devotion that the unity of the whole fellowship will be fulfilled.

V. This means an adventure of goodwill and still more of faith, for nothing less is required than a new discovery of the creative resources of God. To this adventure we are convinced that God is now calling all the members of His Church.

VI. We believe that the visible unity of the Church will be found to involve the whole-hearted acceptance of :—

The Holy Scriptures, as the record of God's revelation of Himself to man, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith; and the Creed commonly called Nicene, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith, and either it or the Apostles' Creed as the Baptismal confession of belief :

The divinely instituted sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion, as expressing for all the corporate life of the whole fellowship in and with Christ :

A ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body.

VII. May we not reasonably claim that the Episcopate is the one means of providing such a ministry? It is not that we call in question for a moment the spiritual reality of the ministries of those Communions which do not possess the Episcopate. On the contrary we thankfully acknowledge that these ministries have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace. But we submit that considerations alike of history and of present experience justify the claim which we make on behalf of the Episcopate. Moreover, we would urge that it is now and will prove to be in the future the best instrument for maintaining the unity and continuity of the Church. But we greatly desire that the office of a Bishop should be everywhere exercised in a representative and constitutional manner, and more truly express all that ought to be involved for the life of the Christian Family in the title of Father-in-God. Nay more, we eagerly look forward to the day when through its acceptance in a united Church we may all share in that grace which is pledged to the members of the whole body in the apostolic rite of the laying-on of hands, and in the joy and fellowship of a Eucharist in which as one Family we may together, without any doubtfulness of mind, offer to the one Lord our worship and service.

VIII. We believe that for all, the truly equitable approach to union is by the way of mutual deference to one another's

consciences. To this end, we who send forth this appeal would say that if the authorities of other Communions should so desire, we are persuaded that, terms of union having been otherwise satisfactorily adjusted, Bishops and clergy of our Communion would willingly accept from these authorities a form of commission or recognition which would commend our ministry to their congregations, as having its place in the one family life. It is not in our power to know how far this suggestion may be acceptable to those to whom we offer it. We can only say that we offer it in all sincerity as a token of our longing that all ministries of grace, theirs and ours, shall be available for the service of our Lord in a united Church.

It is our hope that the same motive would lead ministers who have not received it to accept a commission through episcopal ordination, as obtaining for them a ministry throughout the whole fellowship.

In so acting no one of us could possibly be taken to repudiate his past ministry. God forbid that any man should repudiate a past experience rich in spiritual blessings for himself and others. Nor would any of us be dishonouring the Holy Spirit of God, Whose call led us all to our several ministries, and Whose power enabled us to perform them. We shall be publicly and formally seeking additional recognition of a new call to wider service in a reunited Church, and imploring for ourselves God's grace and strength to fulfil the same.

IX. The spiritual leadership of the Catholic Church in days to come, for which the world is manifestly waiting, depends upon the readiness with which each group is prepared to make sacrifices for the sake of a common fellowship, a common ministry, and a common service to the world.

We place this ideal first and foremost before ourselves and our own people. We call upon them to make the effort to meet the demands of a new age with a new outlook. To all other Christian people whom our words may reach we make the same appeal. We do not ask that any one Communion should consent to be absorbed in another. We do ask that all should unite in a new and great endeavour to recover and to manifest to the world the unity of the Body of Christ for which He prayed.

---

10. The Conference recommends to the authorities of the Churches of the Anglican Communion that they should, in such ways and at such times as they think best, formally invite the authorities of other Churches within their areas to confer with them concerning the possibility of taking definite steps to co-operate in a common endeavour, on the lines set forth in the above Appeal, to restore the unity of the Church of Christ.

11. The Conference recognizes that the task of effecting union with other Christian Communions must be undertaken by the various national, regional, or provincial authorities of the Churches within the Anglican Communion, and confidently commits to them the carrying out of this task on lines that are in general harmony with the principles underlying its Appeal and Resolutions.

12. The Conference approves the following statements as representing the counsel which it is prepared to give to the Bishops, Clergy and other members of our own Communion on various subjects which bear upon the problems of reunion, provided that such counsel is not to be regarded as calling in question any Canons or official declarations of any Synod or House of Bishops of a national, regional, or provincial Church which has already dealt with these matters.

(*A*) *In view of prospects and projects of reunion—*

(i) A Bishop is justified in giving occasional authorization to ministers, not episcopally ordained, who in his judgement are working towards an ideal of union such as is described in our Appeal, to preach in churches within his Diocese, and to clergy of the Diocese to preach in the churches of such ministers:

(ii) The Bishops of the Anglican Communion will not question the action of any Bishop who, in the few years between the initiation and the completion of a definite scheme of union, shall countenance the irregularity of admitting to Communion the baptized but unconfirmed Communicants of the non-episcopal congregations concerned in the scheme:

(iii) The Conference gives its general approval to the suggestions contained in the report of the Sub-Committee on Reunion with Non-Episcopal Churches in reference to the status and work of ministers who may remain after union without episcopal ordination (see pages 142 and 143.)

(*B*) *Believing, however, that certain lines of action might imperil both the attainment of its ideal and the unity of its own Communion, the Conference declares that—*

(i) It cannot approve of general schemes of intercommunion or exchange of pulpits:

(ii) In accordance with the principle of Church order set forth in the Preface to the Ordinal attached to the Book of Common Prayer, it cannot approve the celebration in Anglican churches of the Holy Communion for members of the Anglican Church by ministers who have not been episcopally ordained; and that it should be regarded as the general rule of the Church that Anglican communicants should receive Holy Communion only at the hands of ministers of their own Church, or of Churches in communion therewith.

(C) *In view of doubts and varieties of practice which have caused difficulties in the past, the Conference declares that—*

(i) Nothing in these Resolutions is intended to indicate that the rule of Confirmation as conditioning admission to the Holy Communion must necessarily apply to the case of baptized persons who seek Communion under conditions which in the Bishop's judgement justify their admission thereto.

(ii) In cases in which it is impossible for the Bishop's judgement to be obtained beforehand the priest should remember that he has no canonical authority to refuse Communion to any baptized person kneeling before the Lord's Table (unless he be excommunicate by name, or, in the canonical sense of the term, a cause of scandal to the faithful); and that, if a question may properly be raised as to the future admission of any such person to Holy Communion, either because he has not been confirmed or for other reasons, the priest should refer the matter to the Bishop for counsel or direction.

13. The Conference recommends that, wherever it has not already been done, Councils representing all Christian Communions should be formed within such areas as may be deemed most convenient, as centres of united effort to promote the physical, moral, and social welfare of the people, and the extension of the rule of Christ among all nations and over every region of human life.

14. It is important to the cause of reunion that every branch of the Anglican Communion should develop the constitutional government of the Church and should make a fuller use of the capacities of its members for service.

15. The Conference urges on every branch of the Anglican Communion that it should prepare its members for taking their part in the universal fellowship of the re-united Church, by setting before them the loyalty which they owe to the universal Church, and the charity and understanding which are required of the members of so inclusive a society.

16. We desire to express our profound thankfulness for the important movements towards unity which, during the last twelve years, have taken place in many parts of the world, and for the earnest desire for reunion which has been manifested both in our own Communion and among the Churches now separated from us. In particular, the Conference has heard with sympathetic and hopeful interest of the preliminary meeting of the proposed

World Conference on Faith and Order about to be held at Geneva, and earnestly prays that its deliberations may tend towards the reunion of the Christian Church.

---

17. We desire to express our deep sympathy with the Church of Russia in the terrible persecution which it has in many places suffered. We earnestly trust that in the providence of God its difficulties may speedily be removed, and that it may be enabled in renewed life and strength so to carry on its work unhindered as to further, in the life of the Russian people, whatsoever things are true and just, whatsoever things are lovely and of good report.

18. The Conference heartily thanks the Œcumenical Patriarchate for the mission of the Metropolitan of Demotica and others to confer with its members on questions concerning the relations between the Anglican and Eastern Churches, and expresses its grateful appreciation of the great help given to its Committee by the Delegation.

19. The Conference welcomes the appointment by the Archbishop of Canterbury of an "Eastern Churches' Committee" on a permanent basis, in pursuance of Resolution 61 of the Conference of 1908; and looks forward hopefully to the work of that Committee, in conjunction with similar Committees appointed in Constantinople and Athens, as helping greatly to forward the cause of reunion with the Orthodox Church.

20. The Conference expresses its heartfelt sympathy with the Armenian, Assyrian, and Syrian Jacobite Christians in the persecutions which they have been called upon to endure, deploring with indignation the terrible massacres that have taken place among them both before and during the Great War; and earnestly prays that in the rearrangement of the political affairs of the East they may be granted a righteous government and freedom from oppression for the future.

21. The Conference has received with satisfaction its Committee's report of the investigations that have been made during the last twelve years with regard to the present doctrinal position of the Separated Churches of the East; and without expressing an opinion as to the past, believes that these investigations have gone far towards shewing that any errors as to the Incarnation of our Lord which may at some period of their history have been attributed to them, have at any rate now passed away.

22. The Conference repeats the proposal made by the Conference of 1908 that, when any of the Separated Churches of the East desire closer relations with us, and wish for the establishment of occasional intercommunion, and give satisfactory assurances as to their faith, such relations should at once be established.

23. The Conference respectfully requests the Archbishop of Canterbury to take advantage of any opportunity that may arise to enter into friendly relations with these Churches, and to inform the authorities of the Orthodox Eastern Church of any steps that may be taken in the direction of intercommunion with them. Similar action should be taken with regard to informing the Metropolitans of our own Communion.

24. The Conference welcomes the Report of the Commission appointed after the last Conference entitled, "The Church of England and the Church of Sweden," and, accepting the conclusions there maintained on the succession of the Bishops of the Church of Sweden and the conception of the priesthood set forth in its standards, recommends that members of that Church, qualified to receive the Sacrament in their own Church, should be admitted to Holy Communion in ours. It also recommends that on suitable occasions permission should be given to Swedish ecclesiastics to give addresses in our churches.

If the authorities of any Province of the Anglican Communion find local irregularities in the order or practice of the Church of Sweden outside that country, they may legitimately, within their own region, postpone any such action as is recommended in this Resolution until they are satisfied that these irregularities have been removed.

25. We recommend further that in the event of an invitation being extended to an Anglican Bishop or Bishops to take part in the consecration of a Swedish Bishop, the invitation should, if possible, be accepted, subject to the approval of the Metropolitan. We also recommend that, in the first instance, as an evident token of the restoration of closer relations between the two Churches, if possible more than one of our Bishops should take part in the Consecration.

26. The Conference thanks the Old Catholic Bishops for their explanation, in response to the letter of the Archbishop of Canterbury, of their action in consecrating the Rev. A. H. Mathew to the Episcopate in 1908, and repeats the desire expressed at previous Conferences to maintain and strengthen the friendly relations which exist between the Churches of the Anglican Communion and the ancient Church of Holland and

the Old Catholic Churches, especially in Germany, Switzerland and Austria.

27. We regret that on a review of all the facts we are unable to regard the so-called Old Catholic Church in Great Britain (under the late Bishop Mathew and his successors), and its extensions overseas, as a properly constituted Church, or to recognize the orders of its ministers, and we recommend that, in the event of any of its ministers desiring to join our communion, who are in other respects duly qualified, they should be ordained *sub conditione* in accordance with the provisions suggested in the Report of our Committee.

28. The Conference recommends that the same course be followed, as occasion may require, in the case of persons claiming to have received consecration or ordination from any "episcopi vagantes," whose claims we are unable to recognize.

29. The Conference, while welcoming the Report of the Committee appointed by the Conference of 1908 on the *Unitas Fratrum* or Moravians, regrets that it is unable to recommend any such action being taken as is suggested in resolutions 70–72 of that Conference so long as the *Unitas* retains its practice of the administration of Confirmation and the celebration of Holy Communion by deacons, but hopes that, in the event of the *Unitas* changing its rules in these matters, negotiations with individual Provinces of the *Unitas* may be resumed, and believes that in this case there would be good prospect of such negotiations being brought to a satisfactory conclusion.

30. We recommend with a view to this end that the Archbishop of Canterbury be respectfully requested to reappoint with additional members the Committee appointed at the last Conference; and we hope that, in the event of all the remaining difficulties being removed to his satisfaction, with the concurrence of the Central Consultative Body of the Lambeth Conference, the action suggested in the Resolutions of the Conference of 1908 may take place without further delay.

31. The Conference regrets that it is unable to recommend the acceptance of the proposals of the "Southern Synod" of the "Reformed Episcopal Church" in England for reunion with the Church of England, and, while unable to advise the acceptance of other proposals for corporate union with the Reformed Episcopal Church, recommends that, if applications for admission

into the English Church are made by individual ministers of that Communion, such applications should be sympathetically received, and the ministers, if in all respects equal to the standard and requirements of the Church of England, be ordained *sub conditione*.

Missionary Problems.

32. The Conference declares its conviction that the present critical position of the world calls, as perhaps never before, for the presentation of Jesus Christ and His redemption to every race and individual; and, in view of the urgent need for workers in many dioceses overseas, earnestly appeals to men, both clerical and lay, and to women, to dedicate themselves to the service of the Church in those dioceses.

33. The normal method of missions is that in which the whole Church, within any area, acts as a missionary body expressly organized for that function, and the principle which underlies this method is capable of universal application. While we humbly thank God for the work of the Missionary Societies, we consider that these Societies, where they exist, should not stand outside the one organization, but should be elements in it, co-ordinated, whether by a central advisory council or otherwise, under the supreme Synodical Authority, but retaining severally such degrees of independence as the conditions of their efficiency demand.

34. The Conference thankfully recognizes the practical steps which Missionary Societies and Boards have taken towards the realization of the ultimate aim of all Mission work, namely, the establishment of self-governing, self-supporting, and self-extending Churches, from which outside control has been withdrawn at the earliest moment, so as to allow the free expression of their national character.

It would urge further that the call for such action is in the present day more insistent than ever before, and believes that, generally speaking, the Societies and Boards can best achieve their purpose by making their work centre from the first in the Church rather than in the mission organization, and in particular—

(1) By the establishment of Councils which shall be fully representative of the congregations, and have real responsibilities of government;

(2) By substituting for committees and councils representative chiefly of the mission and its subscribers, Diocesan Boards and Committees, and in general associating all their work with the Diocesan organization;

(3) By entrusting to these local bodies a real share in the financial control and general direction of the work of the Mission;

(4) By giving the widest freedom to indigenous workers to develop the work in their own countries on lines in accordance with their national character.

35. The territorial Episcopate has been the normal development in the Catholic Church, but we recognize that difference of race and language sometimes requires that provision should be made in a Province for freedom of development of races side by side; the solution in each case must be left with the Province, but we are clear that the ideal of the one Church should never be obscured.

36. While maintaining the authority of the Book of Common Prayer as the Anglican standard of doctrine and practice, we consider that liturgical uniformity should not be regarded as a necessity throughout the Churches of the Anglican Communion. The conditions of the Church in many parts of the Mission Field render inapplicable the retention of that Book as the one fixed liturgical model.

37. Although the inherent right of a Diocesan Bishop to put forth or sanction liturgical forms is subject to such limitations as may be imposed by higher synodical authority, it is desirable that such authority should not be too rigidly exercised so long as those features are retained which are essential to the safeguarding of the unity of the Anglican Communion.

38. The Conference recommends the appointment of a Committee of students of liturgical questions which would be ready to advise any Diocese or Province on the Form and Matter of services proposed for adoption, and requests the Archbishop of Canterbury to take such steps as he deems best to give early effect to this Resolution.

39. It is of very real importance that the Marriage Law of the Church should be understood and administered as far as possible consistently, in all parts of the Anglican Communion, and the Conference commends to the consideration of the Church the suggestions of the Committee on Missionary Problems dealing with this subject which have been made after consultation with experts, and are contained in their Report.

40. Whereas from time to time restrictions on Missionary Freedom have been imposed by Governments, we desire to reaffirm the duty which rests upon every Christian man and woman, of propagating the Faith of Christ, and to claim that any restrictions should be of a strictly temporary nature only, so that freedom of opportunity to fulfil this spiritual obligation may be afforded to Christians of all nationalities.

41. On the subject of the relation of Governments and Government officials to Christianity and other Faiths, the Conference gives its approval to the words used in paragraphs 2 and 3 on page 92 in the Report on Missionary Problems, and commends them to the careful consideration of all concerned.

42. We gratefully acknowledge the valuable work done by British and American Missionary Conferences in safeguarding missionary interests, and believe that such Conferences, both National and International, while claiming no coercive power, have a great part to play in fostering international understanding and goodwill, co-ordinating work, formulating common policies, and serving as a practical medium of communication between Missions and Governments in matters of general Missionary concern.

Development of Provinces.

43. Whereas it is undesirable that Dioceses should remain indefinitely in isolation or attached only to a distant Province, the gradual creation of new Provinces should be encouraged, and each newly founded Diocese should as soon as possible find its place as a constituent member in some neighbouring Province. The fact that Dioceses proposing to form a Province owe their origin to missions of different branches of the Anglican Communion need be no bar to such action.

(*a*) In the opinion of the Conference four is the minimum number of Dioceses suitable to form a Province. No number should be considered too great to form a Province, so long as the Bishops and other representatives of the Diocese are able conveniently to meet for mutual consultation and for the transaction of provincial business.

(*b*) In the initiation of any Province in the future, the organization which the Conference deems essential to provincial life is a House or College of Bishops to which the Metropolitans or the Presiding Bishops concerned have conveyed their authority for the consecration of Bishops. It is desirable that when a

new Province is formed the Bishops of the constituent Dioceses should transfer their allegiance to the Metropolitan of the Province or other authority constitutionally appointed to receive it, and thereafter all Bishops consecrated for the service of the Province should take the oath of canonical obedience to the Metropolitan or make a declaration of conformity to other authority before mentioned.

(*c*) In newly established Provinces arrangements should be made whereby the Province should have some distinct voice in the election of its Metropolitan.

(*d*) As to the *sedes* of the Metropolitan customs vary and the decision must depend on local circumstances.

(*e*) Until a Missionary Diocese becomes largely self-supporting and is self-governed by a Synod the appointment of its Bishop should rest with the Province to which it is attached, after consultation with the Diocese and in such a way as the Province may decide.

(*f*) A newly constituted Synod of Bishops shall proceed as soon as possible to associate with itself in some official way the clergy and laity of the Province, provided that in the case of Provinces including Missionary Dioceses this procedure shall be subordinate to local circumstances. It is understood that each national and regional Church will determine its own constitutional and canonical enactments.

Consultative Body.

44. In order to prevent misapprehension the Conference declares that the Consultative Body, created by the Lambeth Conference of 1897 and consolidated by the Conference of 1908, is a purely advisory Body. It is of the nature of a continuation Committee of the whole Conference and neither possesses nor claims any executive or administrative power. It is framed so as to represent all branches of the Anglican Communion and it offers advice only when advice is asked for.

(*a*) The existing Consultative Body shall be reconstructed on the following plan of representation:—It shall consist of the Archbishop of Canterbury (*ex-officio*) and of representative Bishops appointed as follows: Province of Canterbury 1, Province of York 1, Province of Wales 1, the Church of Ireland 1, the Episcopal Church in Scotland 1, the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America 4, the Church of England in Canada 1, the Church of England in the Dioceses of Australia and Tasmania 1, the Church of the Province of New Zealand 1, the Church of the Province of the West Indies 1, the Church of

the Province of South Africa 1, the Church of the Province of India and Ceylon 1, the Churches in China and Japan and the Diocese of Corea 1, the Missionary and other extra-provincial Bishops under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Canterbury 1. Total 18.

(*b*) The Churches that appoint Representatives shall be free to fix the method of appointment, whether by the House of Bishops or by Synod or Convention. A representative Bishop shall be appointed for a definite term not exceeding six years, and need not be a member of the body which appoints him. Any vacancy by death, resignation, or other cause, during the term of office shall be filled by the Church in the representation of which the vacancy occurs.

(*c*) For the purpose of appointing the Bishop who is to represent the body of missionary and other extra-provincial Bishops under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Canterbury, each of those Bishops shall be requested by the Archbishop of Canterbury to nominate a Bishop to him. The list of Bishops so nominated shall be then sent to all the Bishops entitled to vote, and each of them shall, if he thinks fit to vote, send to the Archbishop the name of the one in that list for whom he votes. The largest number of votes shall carry the election.

(*d*) The Central Consultative Body shall be prepared to consider questions referred to it by any Bishop, but shall, before considering as well as in considering them, have careful regard to any limitations upon such references as may be imposed by the regulations of Provinces or of national or regional Churches.

(*e*) The Consultative Body shall not at any meeting come to a decision on any subject not named in the notice summoning the meeting.

45. The Consultative Body is asked to take into its consideration the provisions of the Colonial Clergy Act with a view to their modification.

The Position of Women in the Councils and Ministrations of the Church.

46. Women should be admitted to those Councils of the Church to which laymen are admitted, and on equal terms. Diocesan, Provincial, or National Synods may decide when or how this principle is to be brought into effect.

47. The time has come when, in the interests of the Church at large, and in particular of the development of the Ministry of

Women, the Diaconate of Women should be restored formally and canonically, and should be recognized throughout the Anglican Communion.

48. The Order of Deaconesses is for women the one and only Order of the Ministry which has the stamp of Apostolic approval, and is for women the only Order of the Ministry which we can recommend that our Branch of the Catholic Church should recognize and use.

49. The office of a Deaconess is primarily a ministry of suc cour, bodily and spiritual, especially to women, and should follow the lines of the primitive rather than of the modern Diaconate of men. It should be understood that the Deaconess dedicates herself to a lifelong service, but that no vow or implied promise of celibacy should be required as necessary for admission to the Order. Nevertheless, Deaconesses who desire to do so may legitimately pledge themselves either as members of a Community, or as individuals, to a celibate life.

50. In every branch of the Anglican Communion there should be adopted a Form and Manner of Making of Deaconesses such as might fitly find a place in the Book of Common Prayer, containing in all cases provision for :—

(*a*) Prayer by the Bishop and the laying on of his hands ;
(*b*) A formula giving authority to execute the Office of a Deaconess in the Church of God ;
(*c*) The delivery of the New Testament by the Bishop to each candidate.

51. The Forms for the Making and Ordering of Deaconesses should be of the same general character, and as far as possible similar in their most significant parts, though varying in less important details in accordance with local needs.

52. The following functions may be entrusted to the Deaconess, in addition to the ordinary duties which would naturally fall to her :—

(*a*) To prepare candidates for Baptism and Confirmation ;
(*b*) To assist at the administration of Holy Baptism ; and to be the administrant in cases of necessity in virtue of her office ;
(*c*) To pray with and to give counsel to such women as desire help in difficulties and perplexities.
(*d*) With the approval of the Bishop and of the Parish Priest, and under such conditions as shall from time to time be laid down by the Bishop : (i) in Church to read Morning and Evening

Prayer and the Litany, except such portions as are assigned to the Priest only; (ii) in Church also to lead in prayer and, under licence of the Bishop, to instruct and exhort the Congregation.

[*Note.*—Clause *d* (ii) was carried by 117 votes to 81.]

53. Opportunity should be given to women as to men (duly qualified and approved by the Bishop) to speak in consecrated or unconsecrated buildings, and to lead in prayer, at other than the regular and appointed services of the Church. Such diocesan arrangements, both for men and for women, should wherever possible be subject to Provincial control and co-ordination.

54. The Conference recommends that careful inquiry should be made in the several branches of the Anglican Communion as to the position and recognition of women workers in the Church, the conditions of their employment, and the remuneration of those who receive salaries.

Spiritualism, Christian Science, Theosophy.

55. We reaffirm our conviction that the revelation of God in Christ Jesus is the supreme and sufficient message given to all mankind, whereby we may attain to eternal life. We recognize that modern movements of thought connected with Spiritualism, Christian Science, and Theosophy join with the Christian Church in protesting against a materialistic view of the universe and at some points emphasize partially neglected aspects of truth. At the same time, we feel bound to call attention to the fact that both in the underlying philosophy and in cults and practices which have arisen out of these movements, the teaching given or implied either ignores or explains away or contradicts the unique and central fact of human history, namely, the Incarnation of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

56. We recognize that new phenomena of consciousness have been presented to us, which claim, and at the hands of competent psychologists have received, careful investigation, and, as far as possible, the application of scientific method. But such scientific researches have confessedly not reached an advanced stage, and we are supported by the best psychologists in warning our people against accepting as final theories which further knowledge may disprove, and still more against the indiscriminate and undisciplined exercise of psychic powers, and the habit of recourse to *séances*, "seers," and mediums.

Spiritualism.

57. The Conference, while prepared to expect and welcome new light from psychical research upon the powers and processes of the spirit of man, urges strongly that a larger place should be given in the teaching of the Church to the explanation of the true grounds of Christian belief in eternal life, and in immortality, and of the true content of belief in the Communion of Saints as involving real fellowship with the departed through the love of God in Christ Jesus.

58. The Conference, while recognizing that the results of investigation have encouraged many people to find a spiritual meaning and purpose in human life and led them to believe in survival after death, sees grave dangers in the tendency to make a religion of spiritualism. The practice of spiritualism as a cult involves the subordination of the intelligence and the will to unknown forces or personalities and, to that extent, an abdication of the self-control to which God has called us. It tends to divert attention from the approach to God through the one Mediator, Jesus Christ, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit; to ignore the discipline of faith as the path of spiritual training; and to depreciate the divinely ordained channels of grace and truth revealed and given through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Christian Science.

59. The Conference finds that while Christian Science fixes attention on the supremacy of spirit, yet in the teaching given there is a direct tendency (*a*) to pantheistic doctrine, and at the same time (*b*) to a false antithesis between spirit and matter, and (*c*) to the denial of the reality of sin, and (*d*) to the denial of the reality of disease and suffering. Such teaching, therefore, cannot be reconciled with the fundamental truths of the Christian Faith and the teaching of Scripture on atonement, penitence, forgiveness, and fellowship in the sufferings of Christ.

60. The Conference reminds the Church that intimate communion with God has been the privilege and joy of the Saints in every age. This communion, realised in union with Christ through the Holy Spirit, influences the whole personality of man, physical and spiritual, enabling him to share his Lord's triumph over sin, disease and death.

61. We therefore urge upon the clergy of the Anglican Communion the duty of a more thorough study of the many-sided enterprise of prayer in order that they may become more efficient teachers and trainers of their people in this work, so

that through the daily practice of prayer and meditation the corporate faith of the Church may be renewed, and the fruit of the Spirit may be more manifest in the daily lives of professing Christians, and the power of Christ to heal may be released.

62. We declare our thankfulness for the devoted labours of those engaged in scientific research and for the progress made in medicine, surgery, nursing, hygiene and sanitation. Believing that all these means of healing and preventing disease and relieving suffering are gifts that come from God, we acknowledge our duty to use them faithfully for the welfare of mankind.

63. For the general guidance of the Church the Conference requests the Archbishop of Canterbury to appoint a Committee to consider and report as early as possible upon the use with prayer of the laying on of hands, of the unction of the sick and other spiritual means of healing, the findings of such a Committee to be reported forthwith to the authorities of the national, provincial, and regional Churches of the Anglican Communion.

Theosophy.

64. The Conference, while recognizing that the three publicly stated objects of the Theosophical Society (see Report, p. 126) do not in themselves appear to be inconsistent with loyal membership of the Church, desires to express its conviction that there are cardinal elements in the positive teaching current in theosophical circles and literature which are irreconcilable with the Christian faith as to the Person and mission of Christ and with the missionary claim and duty of the Christian religion as the message of God to all mankind. The Conference warns Christian people, who may be induced to make a study of theosophy by the seemingly Christian elements contained in it, to be on their guard against the ultimate bearing of theosophical teaching, and urges them to examine strictly the character and credentials of the teachers upon whose authority they are encouraged or compelled to rely.

65. The Conference, believing that the attraction of Theosophy for some Christian people lies largely in its presentation of Christian faith as a quest for knowledge, recommends that in the current teaching of the Church due regard should be given to the mystical elements of faith and life which underlie the historic belief of Christendom, and on the other hand urges all thinking people to safeguard their Christian position by a fuller study of the Bible, Creed, and Sacraments in the light of sound Christian scholarship and philosophy.

Problems of Marriage and Sexual Morality.

66. Recognizing that to live a pure and chaste life before and after marriage is, for both sexes, the unchangeable Christian standard, attainable and attained through the help of the Holy Spirit by men and women in every age, the Conference desires to proclaim the universal obligation of this standard, and its vital importance as an essential condition of human happiness.

67. The Conference affirms as our Lord's principle and standard of marriage a life-long and indissoluble union, for better for worse, of one man with one woman, to the exclusion of all others on either side, and calls on all Christian people to maintain and bear witness to this standard.

Nevertheless, the Conference admits the right of a national or regional Church within our Communion to deal with cases which fall within the exception mentioned in the record of our Lord's words in St. Matthew's Gospel, under provisions which such Church may lay down.

The Conference, while fully recognizing the extreme difficulty of governments in framing marriage laws for citizens many of whom do not accept the Christian standard, expresses its firm belief that in every country the Church should be free to bear witness to that standard through its powers of administration and discipline exercised in relation to its own members.

68. The Conference, while declining to lay down rules which will meet the needs of every abnormal case, regards with grave concern the spread in modern society of theories and practices hostile to the family. We utter an emphatic warning against the use of unnatural means for the avoidance of conception, together with the grave dangers—physical, moral, and religious—thereby incurred, and against the evils with which the extension of such use threatens the race. In opposition to the teaching which, under the name of science and religion, encourages married people in the deliberate cultivation of sexual union as an end in itself, we steadfastly uphold what must always be regarded as the governing considerations of Christian marriage. One is the primary purpose for which marriage exists, namely the continuation of the race through the gift and heritage of children; the other is the paramount importance in married life of deliberate and thoughtful self-control.

We desire solemnly to commend what we have said to Christian people and to all who will hear.

69. The Conference, moved by responsible statements from many nations as to the prevalence of venereal diseases, bringing suffering, paralysis, insanity, or death to many thousands of the innocent as well as the guilty, supports all efforts which are consistent with high moral standards to check the causes of the diseases and to treat and, if possible, cure the victims. We impress upon the clergy and members of the Church the duty of joining with physicians and public authorities in meeting this scourge, and urge the clergy to guide those who turn to them for advice with knowledge, sympathy, and directness. The Conference must condemn the distribution or use, before exposure to infection, of so-called prophylactics, since these cannot but be regarded as an invitation to vice.

70. The Conference urges the importance of enlisting the help of all high-principled men and women, whatever be their religious beliefs, in co-operation with or, if necessary, in bringing pressure to bear upon, authorities both national and local, for removing such incentives to vice as indecent literature, suggestive plays and films, the open or secret sale of contraceptives, and the continued existence of brothels.

71. With regard to the education of the young in matters of sex, the Conference presses upon parents that the duty of giving right teaching on these subjects rests primarily with them, and that it is the duty of all persons giving such instruction to prepare themselves for this responsible task. Boys and girls should be guarded against the danger of acquiring knowledge of sexual subjects from wrong persons and in wrong ways.

72. Bearing in remembrance the example of our Lord, and the prominent place that He gave in His ministry to protecting the weak and raising the fallen, the Conference deplores the common apathy of Church people in regard to Preventive and Rescue Work, and urges on Bishops, Clergy, and all Christian people the duty of taking a more active share in this essential part of the Church's life.

Social and Industrial Questions.

73. We desire to emphasize our conviction that the pursuit of mere self-interest, whether individual or corporate, will never bring healing to the wounds of Society. This conviction is at once exemplified and reinforced by what has happened in and since the War. Nor is this less true when that self-interest is

equipped with every advantage of science and education. Our only hope lies in reverent allegiance to the Person of Christ, whose Law is the Law of Love, in acceptance of His principles, and reliance on His power.

74. An outstanding and pressing duty of the Church is to convince its members of the necessity of nothing less than a fundamental change in the spirit and working of our economic life. This change can only be effected by accepting as the basis of industrial relations the principle of co-operation in service for the common good in place of unrestricted competition for private or sectional advantage. All Christian people ought to take an active part in bringing about this change, by which alone we can hope to remove class dissensions and resolve industrial discords.

75. The Church cannot in its corporate capacity be an advocate or partisan, "a judge or a divider," in political or class disputes where moral issues are not at stake; nevertheless even in matters of economic and political controversy the Church is bound to give its positive and active corporate witness to the Christian principles of justice, brotherhood, and the equal and infinite value of every human personality.

76. In obedience to Christ's teaching as to covetousness and self-seeking, the Conference calls upon all members of His Church to be foremost both by personal action and sacrifice in maintaining the superiority of the claims of human life to those of property. To this end it would emphasize the duty which is laid upon all Christians of setting human values above dividends and profits in their conduct of business, of avoiding extravagance and waste, and of upholding a high standard of honour and thoroughness in work. In a word, they must set an example in subordinating the claim for rights to the call of duty.

77. Members of the Church are bound to take an active part, by public action and by personal service, in removing those abuses which depress and impoverish human life. In company with other citizens and organizations they should work for reform, and particularly for such measures as will secure the better care of children, including real opportunity for an adequate education; protection of the workers against unemployment; and the provision of healthy homes.

78. The Church is bound to use its influence to remove inhuman or oppressive conditions of labour in all parts of the world,

especially among the weaker races, and to give its full support to those clauses in the League of Nations Covenant which aim at raising by international agreement the status of industrial workers in all countries.

79. The Conference notes with deep interest the prohibition by the will of the people of the sale and manufacture of intoxicating drinks in the Republic of the United States of America, and of their sale in most of the Provinces of Canada, and commends this action to the earnest and sympathetic attention of the Christian Church throughout the world. The Conference urges members of the Church in other countries—

(1) To support such legislation as will lead to a speedy reduction in the use of intoxicants ;

(2) To recognize the duty of combating the evil of intemperance by personal example and willing self-sacrifice.

80. If the Church is to witness without reproach for justice and brotherhood in the world, it must shew itself serious and insistent in reforming abuses within its own organization, and in promoting brotherhood among its own members. Further, if Christian witness is to be fully effective it must be borne by nothing short of the whole body of Christian people.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

N.B.—*The following Reports must be taken as having the authority only of the Committees by whom they were respectively prepared and presented. The Committees were not in every case unanimous in adopting the Reports.*

The Conference, as a whole, is responsible only for the formal Resolutions agreed to after discussion, and printed above.

*** *An asterisk placed after the name of any Member of Committee denotes that he was unable to attend any of the Meetings of that Committee.*

No. I.

Report of the Committee† Appointed to Consider and Report upon the Subject of Christianity and International Relations, especially the League of Nations.

We are in no doubt as to the main tenor of our message. Humanity has suffered long years, and, for all its expenditure of blood and treasure, has been "nothing bettered," but is rather grown worse, and is now feeling dimly for the hem of His garment by whose power alone it may be made whole. One by one our human expedients have failed. Defensive armaments on the principle *si vis pacem, para bellum*, alliances to secure the balance of power, the efforts of noble minded diplomatists through the concert of Europe, and the far-seeing pronouncements of experts in international law, all have contributed their quota, but the world's wound is not healed, and now the League of Nations—the latest and greatest of all human expedients—is painfully struggling into life. What is the moral of all this? The moral is that the social order for which humanity hungers is beyond the reach of merely human expedients. Nothing will establish peace on the earth but a new creation from God in response to repentance and prayer.

At the present moment there are two alternatives before the world. On the one hand we may relapse into the old conditions, with an attempted balance of power, and the piling up of armaments with their attendant expenditure, until the world is ready for another and even more hideous war. On the other hand, we may work for the ideal for mankind which shines before us in the pages of the New Testament, guided by the principles which we have learnt from the Lord Jesus Christ.

† Names of Members of the Committee :—

Bishop of Aberdeen*
Bishop of Adelaide
Bishop in Argentina
Bishop of Arizona
Archbishop of Brisbane (*Chairman*)
Bishop of Connecticut
Bishop in Corea*
Bishop of Durham
Bishop of George
Bishop of Kalgoorlie*
Bishop of Kampala (*Secretary*)
Bishop of Kimberley
Bishop of Kwangsi
Bishop of Lichfield
Bishop of Lincoln*
Bishop of Maryland
Bishop of Massachusetts
Bishop of Mombasa*
Bishop of Natal
Bishop of New Westminster
Bishop of North Carolina
Bishop of Southern Rhodesia*
Archbishop of Nova Scotia
Bishop Oluwole
Bishop of Oxford
Bishop Roach
Bishop of Sodor and Man
Bishop of Southwell
Bishop of Washington
Archbishop of West Indies
Bishop of Winchester
Bishop of Worcester
Bishop of Zanzibar

I.

The Divine Purpose.

The ideal for human life hangs before Christian eyes in the form of a perfect city through whose ever-open gates the nations and their rulers bring their several distinctive contributions of strength or beauty. The Vision of the Apocalypse sets before us the ultimate consummation in the mind of God of the spiritual development of the nations. In the City of God there is no merging of individuality in a common impersonal existence. Not only the individual, but the nations, will there realize themselves and achieve maturity. The glory of the Kingdom will be the sum total of the glory of the nations, not some new thing in which the nations will be submerged and disappear. "The kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour into it." And, again, the nations of the earth will enter upon this full spiritual maturity in proportion as they rise out of the self-seeking, the pride, the avarice, the dishonesty which at present stain political relations. "There shall in no wise enter into it anything that defileth or maketh a lie."

This may seem an elusive conception, but it is essential that all who are working for the world's progress—the statesmen, the teachers, the leaders of commerce—should take hold of the ideal, not as opportunists, but as master-builders, working to a divine plan.

The principles of true progress, imperfectly recognized in all higher morality, are brought into simplicity, coherence and fulness in Jesus Christ. They are disclosed in His precepts, and embodied in His example: "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." The law of unselfish human neighbourliness is expressly declared as fundamental. It gives the principle which must be applied to all human relations. Three applications of it stand out as germane to the subject before us.

(1) First, there is the duty and dignity of service, and the consequent responsibility of the nations for the service of each other and of the whole. "He that is great" is to be "as he that doth serve." The Son of Man came as he that serveth. It follows that a nation's chiefest claim to greatness is its consciousness of a mission to humanity. Not in domination, but in service, not in will-to-power, but in will-to-help, not in exploitation, but in trusteeship, lies the true objective of a great nation.

(2) Closely connected with this is another cardinal principle expressed in the Apostolic words:—"Ye are members one of another." It is our Christian duty to recognize that already all the nations, advanced or backward, child races or ancient civilizations, are each of them children in the great family of God. Statesmen thinking for their nation no less than individuals must lay hold of the truth that we are members one of another

and that no national policy can be Christian which ignores the needs and rightful claims of other nations. Neither markets nor territory nor cheap labour must in the future dictate national policy, but only the principles of justice, and the rights of all. If we really want peace we must set our faces decisively against the vested interests which have so often in the past stood behind governments, and vitiated their action.

(3) A third principle is that which comes direct from our Lord's treatment of the child and of the little one. With even fierce emphasis He warns us against the misuse of strength. "Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones . . . It were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were cast into the depths of the sea." This bears with unmistakeable clearness upon the relations of the stronger races to those that are weaker and more backward. And we note with thankfulness that the trend of public opinion has of late set strongly against the exploitation of the weaker races in the interests of the strong. But this responsibility of strong nations involves more than the mere provision of safeguards against wrong: it includes the sympathetic encouragement of those instincts of nationhood which appear as soon as young nations emerge from infancy. The desire to escape from tutelage and to de elop individuality denotes a genuine growth towards a fuller life, and to oppose or ignore this instinct, is to incur danger: the road to internationalism, as it has been well said, "lies through nationalism." But it is well to remember that as the consummation of individuality is found in the corporate life, so the full development of nationhood is contingent upon the acceptance of international obligations. True nationalism and a keen sense of international responsibility are in truth indispensable correlatives.

In these three applications of the law of love may be seen the duty of the nations in their progress towards the City of God; and lest any should suppose that these ideas are Utopian, it is well to point out that the ultimate force, in the last analysis, is not physical, but moral. We all know the common belief that it is the big battalions that have their way. No assertion can be more baseless. The progress of the world has usually been in spite of big battalions, and "nothing is ever settled until it is settled right." We look forward to the day when war between nations will be unthinkable, precisely as duels have become unthinkable in civilized society, because public opinion will not tolerate these absurd and horrible ways of settling disputes. Let us not forget the lesson of the last six years. The nation that had the best trained army in Europe has been defeated. The nation that was richest in munitions of war has lost, because against her were the moral forces of civilization.

II.

The League of Nations.*

In the League of Nations we have an instrument in the application of these great principles, which all Christians should welcome with both hands.

It is no fruit of a sudden impulse: it is strictly in the line of historical development, and crowns the efforts of nations and statesmen from Hugo Grotius to the Hague Conference of 1907. Before we go further, however, it is worth while to remark that its normal and fundamental purpose cannot be fulfilled till normal conditions are restored. It exists in time of peace to prevent war; but we do not yet live in times of peace. We may group the clauses of the Covenant of the League under two great heads—those which provide (to quote from the preamble of the Covenant) for the promotion of "international peace and security," and those which provide for "international co-operation" for the safe-guarding of the weak. It is obvious that both these great objectives are based upon the Christian principles already enunciated.

(1) If the clauses aiming at the prevention of war are not to be a dead letter, we must preach with all our power, in season and out of season, in the drawing-room and in the market-place, in the workshop and in the club, the wickedness of hatred. This at the moment is the most appalling barrier in the way of the League of Nations. In every country at the present time the spirit of hatred is at work. Even among the most Christian of our people we find it active beneath the surface and colouring men's attitude. In many cases this spirit is naked and unashamed, and sings its songs of hatred in fierce defiance; but it is most dangerous when it seems to those who entertain it to be the expression of righteous indignation. They are honestly afraid of ceasing to be angry from mere indolence and indifference. They remember the wickedness and cruelties, and fear lest the world should grow corrupt by loss of a righteous zeal against them. In some cases it is injuries done to other nations and not their own which they want not to forget.

A great responsibility rests in this matter with the Press; for the maintenance or the discouragement of hatred lies mainly there.

We must face the facts. If we wish, whether nation or individual, to enjoy the luxury of hatred, we must pay the price, and the price is another and far more hideous war as soon as ever the nations have sufficiently recovered from their present exhaustion. The very horror of the thought should give us pause:

* The American Bishops of the Committee are cordially agreed in the principle of a League of Nations, but feel obliged to withhold their support of the existing Covenant without certain reservations.

one would think that the inevitable consequences would frighten men out of their hatred; but we should prefer to take higher ground than this. The whole spirit is an utter denial of our Christian calling. We must choose between the spirit of hatred and the spirit of the Lord's Prayer. Is Christendom really so utterly bankrupt of the spirit of Christ?

As a practical example of our duty in this matter, it is incumbent on all Christian people to press for the admission of Germany and other nations into the League at the very earliest moment that the conditions render it possible.

(2) In the mandatory clauses of the Covenant, we see not only an application of Christ's injunction to safeguard the weak, but also a new instrument of unprecedented power for securing justice by international consent. Whatever be the difficulties in the way of effective operation on the political side, the League has already shewn abundant promise in this matter of promoting common international interests. A conspicuous instance of this is the international labour organization in connection with the League. We understand on good authority that this body has accomplished more in eight months for the regulation and betterment of industrial conditions than had been accomplished in years by the old methods of dealing with international affairs. This opens out vistas of hope in other directions. For instance, in China the old abuse of the opium traffic has of late been revived, though morphia is substituted for opium.* The sale of arms and liquor to native races, and still more urgently, the White Slave traffic, have occupied and baffled the energies of philanthropists for years past. In all these great international moral interests any progress made has been mainly, if not entirely,

* The importance of the subject of opium and other habit-forming drugs is evidenced by the place it occupies in the Covenant of the League of Nations, and the text of the Treaty of Peace. Art. 23 (*c*) of the Covenant deals with it in common with the traffic in women and children. Art. 295 of the Treaty, referring to the Opium Convention of 1912 and the Special Protocol of 1914, provides that ratification of the Treaty involves ratification of the Convention and Protocol. In the meantime, through failure specifically of Great Britain, the United States of America, and Japan, morphia, chiefly of European and American manufacture, is going into China in increasing quantity. The figures given by Dr. Wu Lien-Teh in his article on the "Latest Phase of the Narcotic Problem," in the *Peking and Tientsin Times* of April 5th, 1920, are as follows:

1911	5½ tons
1912	7½ ,,
1913	11¼ ,,
1914	14 ,,
1915	16 ,,
1916	16 ,,
1917	22½ ,,
1918	22½ ,,
1919	28 ,,

Immediate and drastic measures should be taken by the governments concerned to bring to a speedy end so shameful a condition of affairs.

due to the initiative and pressure of religious organizations. In the face of great inertia, conventions and conferences have been held, although,in consequence perhaps of inadequate method, they have not proved very effective. The organizations under the League will not only provide a vastly superior machinery, but the moral influence of the nations behind them will be a guarantee that the findings of future conferences will be effectively carried out. In one direction, especially, we look to the future with eager hope. All over the world, and especially in South and East Africa, questions are arising through the conflicting interests of native races and white settlers. It is obvious to the Christian conscience that full justice must be done to the natives in regard to both the tenure of land and to any employment of their labour which involves virtual slavery. We welcome in this connexion the clear statement of the Secretary of State for the Colonies in the House of Lords on July 14th, 1920, that except for certain specified purposes of genuinely public utility, "it is illegal to use force to procure labour in our East African possessions for any purpose whatever." Yet the temptation is still with us to confiscate the land, and to enslave the labour of the native races. The principle of the League involves an absolutely equal claim to justice for the natives and ourselves before the recognized tribunal, and, with all Christians whose consciences have been troubled by what we cannot help calling the shifty policy of governments in these matters, we hail the League of Nations, with its mandatory principles, as the very ally for which, in the past, we have looked and longed in vain.

III.

The Immediate Situation.

We turn from the bright future to the situation of to-day. It is useless to shut our eyes to the fact that, judged by the measure of public interest, the League of Nations is as yet only hovering on the verge of existence. The smaller nations, it is true, shew eagerness; but this can hardly be said of the governments of the great nations, either in Europe or elsewhere. Russia is still an unknown quantity; America hesitates; and Germany is still outside. While individual statesmen are working with noble zeal and devotion, it is obvious that the task is too great for them, unless they can count upon the full support of the spiritual forces of civilization.

How can we get to work? First, we shall press for a fair trial of the League itself—for its practical inauguration to the fullest extent. It is becoming clear, even to the outsider, that there are imperfections in the machinery of the Covenant; and this lays the nations open to a natural temptation to ignore it and seek a solution of difficulties along other channels. Let us frankly face the possibility that the machinery may require

amendment; for nothing could be worse than the perpetuation of an instrument to which everyone would pay homage, but which in practice would only be a cover for decisions reached by other means.

Meanwhile our own immediate duty is to press for an active propaganda throughout the world. Everywhere we meet with much ignorance and indifference, and there is not a little reasoned scepticism. These obstacles must be overcome; and the first necessity is a campaign of education throughout the British Commonwealth and the Republic of the United States, for which we must claim all the collective movements of our time making for genuine internationalism.

(1) Ready to hand is the League of Nations Union, the recognized organization for the propaganda of the League which should have in every place the Church's active co-operation and support. From this Union we shall ask for literature of an educational kind, books on international questions for study circles, schemes of intercession, and administrative methods whereby branches shall be systematically formed throughout the world and their leaders kept in close touch with headquarters.

(2) We shall claim in the next place the co-operation and practical ability of those who form in each free nation so large a section of the people, the organized workers themselves. "The project of the League of Nations," as one of their own leaders has just said, "is the keystone of the new social order that nations desire to build." In the International Labour Conference set up in connexion with the League of Nations 41 nations are already represented. And already practical issues are within sight. For instance, if the proposals of the Washington Conference (November 1919) are carried into effect, the result will be that in Japan child-labour below the age of 14 will be prohibited, a weekly rest-day established, and the working-day reduced from 11 to 9½ hours.

(3) Further organizations are the International Chamber of Commerce, and the Institute for International Affairs. In connexion with the first of these, representative business men from the leading nations are seeking to restore normal conditions, to obviate friction, to foster trade between the various nations. In the Institute is to be welcomed a valuable centre for the interchange of precise knowledge between leaders of public opinion, with a view to a constructive policy in international affairs.

Beside those of a more political and economic character, we look with hope to two definitely spiritual movements.

(4) The World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches is one of them. Though temporarily hindered by the war, this Alliance is now developing rapidly, and in the Conference to be held in Geneva in August 1920 the representatives of twenty nations are expected: it may well grow into a potent ally of the League of Nations Union on the spiritual side.

(5) The other movement is that world-wide organisation of young men and women, the impressive significance of which is not yet, we believe, sufficiently understood. The Student Christian Movement, touching, as it does, the students of all nations at an impressionable time, may become a mighty instrument for propagating the spirit of peace. Already the Universities and Colleges of forty States are represented in it. The youth of the nations is streaming through its gates, and at any given moment the membership may be reckoned at 200,000.

But in all propaganda we must clearly begin with ourselves. We must seek in ourselves and in our fellow Christians a re-adjustment of our ideas for the extension of Christ's Kingdom, and learn to preach the cause of a worldwide good-will as we preach the cause of a worldwide gospel. In our Church Assemblies and Councils, whether National, Provincial, Diocesan or Parochial, internationalism must take its place as an integral part of the Kingdom of Christ which we stand to promote.

The work of propaganda is comparatively easy. More difficult is it to meet the scepticism of practical men who see the undoubted dangers which must ever beset leadership in the cause of peace. There are those who say that in taking up mandates all over the world the British Commonwealth is exposing herself in a score of vulnerable places to the machinations of dangerous political agents. Again, they note that so far Britain is almost alone in the offering of men and money for the police work of the League; and again there is a danger at home in the impatience of those who press for immediate disarmament without reference to the facts of the situation. We do not in the least minimize these dangers, but we appeal to all those who are held back by these or kindred scruples, to view the matter in the Christian way, and to have the courage of faith. If peace is to be achieved, risks must be taken. Most of us decided when the war broke out that it is not God's will that we should break up society by laying down our arms and refusing the responsibilities of war. But our very decision should make us more alert to discern where risks should legitimately be taken. We believe that in supporting the League of Nations, we are called upon to take the risks involved in a frank and open policy of peace. We believe that a bold venture of faith will rally to the League all the unmeasured forces of goodwill which are latent in the nations of the earth.

There is, in our judgement, no other way. The course we urge is a course based upon repentance for the past and bold faith in the call of God's Spirit for the future. If penitence and faith be found in the earth, then the materials will be there for that new creation from God which is the one hope of a corrupt and stricken world.

(Signed) ST. CLAIR BRISBANE,
Chairman.

No. II.

Report of the Committee† Appointed to Consider the Opportunity and Duty of the Church in Regard to Industrial and Social Problems.

I.

The Opportunity.

The difficulty of this present time is the measure of the Church's opportunity. It is part of the heritage of war that our social and industrial problems should press upon us with redoubled insistence. But the turmoil among the nations has opened to the Church a door of witness and of service.

(1) The war shewed us the inevitable result of the attempt to build up civilization on selfishness and force. The doctrine that national power is an end in itself, and that self-interest

† Names of Members of the Committee :—

Bishop of Adelaide
Bishop of Antigua
Bishop of Auckland
Bishop of Barking
Bishop of Bradford
Bishop of Buckingham
Bishop of Calcutta*
Bishop of Cashel
Bishop of Chelmsford*
Bishop of Coventry
Bishop Crossley
Bishop of Croydon
Bishop of Dover
Bishop of Fredericton
Bishop Garland
Bishop of Glasgow
Bishop of Huron
Bishop of Jarrow
Bishop of Kansas*
Bishop of Lichfield (*Chairman*)
Bishop of Maine
Bishop of Michigan
Bishop of Milwaukee
Bishop Nash (Capetown Coadjutor)
Bishop of Nebraska
Bishop of Newark
Bishop of Newcastle (N.S.W.)
Bishop of North Queensland
Bishop of Olympia*
Bishop of Ontario*
Bishop of Persia
Bishop of Peterborough
Bishop of Riverina
Bishop of Rockhampton
Bishop of St. Albans
Bishop of St. Andrews*
Bishop of St. Edmundsbury
Bishop of Sheffield
Bishop of South Carolina
Bishop of Stepney (*Secretary*)
Bishop of Swansea
Bishop of Tasmania
Bishop of Tennessee*
Bishop of Toronto
Bishop of Tuam
Bishop of Warrington
Bishop of Willesden
Bishop of Woolwich

is the ruling principle of political life, could only lead to war. The great prophet of that false doctrine was Germany; but who shall say that it was wholly repudiated by the other nations of the world? Now a similar doctrine has dominated a great part of our industrial system. It has been commonly held that different individuals, different sections or interests or classes, must pursue their own self-interest, and that the result of that pursuit would be the best possible condition of society as a whole. Experience has shewn that this doctrine is false. Where there has been a conflict of interests the issue has been determined by a mere trial of force, instead of by a consideration of what is just between man and man. The result has been a war spirit in industry corresponding to a war spirit among the nations. Our experience of the past five years has led us to the determination that this war spirit shall be cast out. Such a spirit is equally disastrous in the capitalist, who is determined at all costs to maintain the controlling power of capital, and in the disciple of Marx, who preaches "class war" and wishes violently to "expropriate the expropriator." As we desire a League of Nations which shall unite the peoples in a fellowship for the common good, so we look for some means of co-operation within the nation, which by ways of liberty and justice shall transcend all class distinctions, and enable all to make their contribution of service for the welfare of all.

(2) To such a union of goodwill we looked forward when in the stress of war we were forming high hopes for a better and happier order in the days of peace. The sense of national unity against a common foe warranted the hope of a like unity of purpose in making war on misery, poverty, and discord, the common foes of all human life. In the fellowship of the trenches men learned to recognize that no section of the community is wholly bad or wholly good, but that each possesses to a large extent the same good qualities and failings. There was ground for hope that, in their appreciation of the value of fellowship, men would come to loathe the antagonisms of class warfare, and would do their utmost to remove the causes which led to it. Again, the spirit of self-sacrifice, shewn on so wide a scale and in so noble a way by rich and poor alike, taught us afresh that when the right appeal is made, the hearts of men will respond to the call to venture life itself in the cause of justice. Can we believe that the increase of these good fruits of co-operation, comradeship, and sacrifice has been choked by the poisonous aftermath of war? May we not dare to hope that, given the right aim, they will even yet be found abundantly on the side of right in the effort to ameliorate the industrial conditions of our time?

With regard to our general outlook on the future, it may be that there was too much thought of merely material prosperity. But, in the main, our aspirations were sound and true.

If the Church is bound to contend that the first things, which are spiritual, must come first, its members must not forget that Our Lord, who won His victory in the spiritual sphere, intended that victory to cover the whole of life: an applied Christianity must shew the Gospel everywhere in action. If we keep the right aim in view we shall seek to make the outward order of society an embodiment of Christian justice and love. No one could say that this is the character of the social and industrial state of Christendom to-day.

(3) What then is the right aim? The trial of these six years has helped us to the true answer. No self-regarding purpose will suffice: a self-centred individual security or a Church-centred corporate selfishness is equally insufficient: the individual and the Church find themselves when they lose themselves in their ultimate aim, "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness." Any definition of the Kingdom of God must assuredly contain the ideal of "human life according to God's intention." It must include the extension everywhere of the knowledge of God's sovereignty of love, and the claim that His sovereign sway shall govern every part of life: the former is the missionary work of the Church, the latter is the witness of the Church concerning social and industrial righteousness.

We do not for a moment deny that the primary business of the Church is to deal with the individual. Personal relationship with God in Christ is vital religion, and without personal conversion our labour will be vain. But we want the conversion to be real and complete. The converted life is Christ-centred, not self-centred; it means the acceptance of Christ as King. And if He is King anywhere, He must be King everywhere. He cannot be excluded from politics, or industry, or from any of our social relationships. His Kingdom is not of this world, but it finds its expression often in material things. No Christian writer has pleaded more earnestly than Bishop Westcott for the supremacy of the spiritual. He warned us to distinguish between life and the mere means of living; he declared that the Nineteenth century attached an unnatural and abnormal importance to material wealth. Yet he also wrote, "every amelioration of the outward conditions of men's lives is the translation of a fragment of our Creed into action." We are convinced that the Gospel of the Kingdom includes a social message.

Such a conviction must be borne in on all who consider Our Lord's Person, and study the record of His teaching and His work. When He, the eternal Son of God, took our complete human nature He shewed us that nothing human is alien to the mind of God. He entered into and shared all human experience—except the sin which He came to take away. He worked as a carpenter at Nazareth. When, during His ministry,

He went about doing good, He cared for the bodies as well as the souls of men. He came that men might have life and have it abundantly: life at its highest is the eternal life which is fellowship with God, but all that belongs to man's best activities and truest affections comes within the scope of His purpose. His teaching shews the large humanness of His sympathy. The farmer in his fields, the shepherd with his flock, the housewife in her home, the business man with his trade in pearls, and the children playing in the streets—He knew and cared for them all. While it would be unwise to press the details of a parable, the story of the labourers in the vineyard, alluding as it does to the problems of unemployment, thoroughness in work and a living wage, shews how sure was His touch on the labour questions of His day. Our Lord was much more than a social reformer, for He went down to the root of all human life, and those who learn His measure of values, and follow His path of service in the power of His Life, are the men who will transform the world.

Before we consider more fully the message of Christ and try to formulate the Church's duty in these matters, it will be necessary to review some of the special features of the present situation.

II.

Special Features of the Situation.

1. *The Labour Movement.*

What shall we say of the relation of the Church to the Labour Movement, which is one of the outstanding factors in the industrial world? We cannot claim a good record with regard to labour questions. Since the beginning of the industrial revolution only a minority of the members of our Church have insisted on the social application of the Gospel. Now that the conscience of the Christian community has been stirred, we must be content to bear the accusation that we are only trying to make ourselves popular with labour, because labour is now a dominant power. The accusation is not true. We are honestly trying to see and to speak the truth, and those who make that effort will not, in the long run, be popular with any party. The question is not whether labour is friendly to the Church, or whether we can attract labour men to the Church, but whether the ideals of labour are sound and its claims just. No doubt there are strata in the labour movement, as in "the world" generally, which are secularist and materialistic. Certainly, also, there are labour men (though not so many in the English-speaking peoples as on the continent of Europe) who are advocates of violent revolution. But we ought, in all fairness

to judge the labour movement at its best, and to consider what is to be the relation of its idealism to the idealism of the Church. The purpose of the labour movement, at its best, is to secure fulness of life, the opportunity of a complete development of their manhood and womanhood for those who labour; it seeks to furnish a better world for people to live in. While this is also the Church's aim, our supreme task must be to provide better people to live in the world. The labour movement can help the Church by bringing us into touch with actualities, and increasing our discontent with mere pious aspirations; and assuredly the Church can help the labour movement by pointing the way to that spiritual power which alone can bring the law of righteousness and love into permanent action. "He who can spiritualize democracy," said Mazzini, "will save the world."

It must not be inferred from these references to the labour movement that we fail to recognize other efforts for the promotion of a better social order. There are many men and women in all classes of society whose self-sacrificing service is bearing good fruit. And there are captains of industry who are prepared to welcome a complete change in the existing scheme. Mr. W. L. Hichens (chairman of Cammell, Laird and Co.) has said: "No tinkering scheme of piecemeal reform will avail to cure our ills; the light must be let in on all dark places at once; the muddy pools of class selfishness must be cleansed; the self-sacrifice of our soldiers and sailors must find its counterpart in our industrial life."

2. *International Aspects.*

It is of the utmost importance that the international aspects of the industrial question should be constantly remembered. Industrial and social conditions in different parts of Africa and the East, including the exploitation of coloured labour and the labour of children, deliver a clear challenge to our Christian civilization. We are aware that difficult questions are involved: we may take South Africa as an illustration of the intricacy of the problem.

As regards South Africa, the Committee recognizes the complexity of the problem where the most highly skilled European labour is found side by side with a great mass of coloured, native, and Indian labour ranging from skilled to the roughest degree of unskilled capacity. It further acknowledges that in the development of a new country, with people whose wants are few and whose way of life is primitive, a lower rate of pay is for a time legitimate than would be reasonable or possible for civilized workers. But we consider that there are two dangers to be avoided. On the one hand there is the temptation to employers to reduce wages towards a level which would be acceptable to the

less developed race, but insufficient and unfair to the more civilized. On the other hand there is the greater danger of deliberate effort on the part of white men to check that advance of the natives and coloured people which missionary enterprise, education, and contact with civilization are gradually producing; and to exclude them by artificial barriers from a share in skilled employments. A mere "colour-bar" is, in our opinion, both economically and politically unsound, and religiously and morally indefensible. The Cape Province policy of "equal right for all civilized men" is the one which we hope to see extended throughout South Africa, and we welcome the recent repudiation by the Prime Minister, General Smuts, of any intention unjustly to exploit the native races.

The main issue is clear. First of all, we are bound to bring the principles of the Gospel to bear on inhuman and oppressive conditions of labour, whether they obtain at home or in the remote regions of the earth: secondly, we have to act upon the knowledge that the whole world is one and that the establishment of proper conditions of labour anywhere can only be secured on an international basis. We therefore cordially welcome the provisions of the Treaty of Peace which relate to labour, and the conventions and recommendations adopted by the International Labour Conference of the League of Nations at its first annual meeting. It is to be hoped that the process of international agreement thus begun may be carried to a complete fulfilment.

3. *Women in Industry.*

An important feature in the world of labour is the steady increase in the number of women engaged in industry. During the war, especially in the later years, the increase was very large, but that it was not merely temporary is shewn by the fact that there are still in England about three-quarters of a million more women in industry than in 1914.

In the future the numbers will probably tend still further to increase (allowing for fluctuations in trade) from the following causes:—

1. The newly-acquired capacity of women for all kinds of work, together with the tendency to "standardize," so that any one individual has only to learn to do quite a small part of the whole.
2. The fact that many women have tasted the joy of taking their part in the nation's life of industry, with a new sense of comradeship and independence.
3. The increase in the need of additional labour through the extension of industry.

It is most important at the present moment for all to give their most careful study and thought to the very difficult problems which are now confronting women in industry in their natural and legitimate claim for fair remuneration, and in their desire to maintain the highest ideals of family life (which must always form some part of a woman's life). Speaking generally the Church ought to insist that for married women the primary work is the work of the home.

Put briefly the main problem is this :—

1. Should the whole old system of " protected " women's work be restored ? The difficulty of answering this question is illustrated by the fate of the clauses concerning " two shifts " in the Bill recently introduced into the House of Commons.
2. Should the aim be to have perfect equality of wages *and* of conditions of work with men ?

And with regard to the second question :—

Should there be complete fusion of men's and women's work ? Or should women aim at confining themselves to the specialization of such work as would utilize women's particular gifts ?

All women are puzzled over these problems, and at present they have no decided line of policy ; it is the duty of the Church, therefore, to give much time and thought and sympathy to them in their difficulties.

4. *The Drink Question.*

Christian people will not be slow to recognize that moral evils lie at the root of our social disorders. If the devils of greed and selfishness were cast out, the battle would soon be won. There are also three specific evils which cause infinite harm to society—sexual impurity, gambling and intemperance. Sexual impurity, the most disastrous of the three, is dealt with by another Committee. On gambling we have nothing new to say. The evil is always with us, and we can only reiterate that the desire to get something for nothing, and the passion for excitement which it nourishes, are always demoralizing, and in their worst forms lead to utter corruption of character. The whole instinct of gambling is selfish and anti-social. The third evil, owing to recent developments, calls for more special treatment.

That an enormous amount of loss in efficiency in the industrial world, and of injury and suffering in our social life, is caused by drink is proved by an overwhelming amount of evidence. To this we earnestly call attention. Immediate and adequate action is required.

In the Report of the Lambeth Conference of 1888 on Intemperance (which was signed by Archbishop Temple) it is asserted that "if the whole Church had been thoroughly alive to the extent and nature of the mischief, much might have been done by more earnest efforts both of the Clergy and Laity in the ordinary course of the Church's work." These words may emphatically be repeated to-day.

In some directions much has been done. The Republic of the United States, after having tried prohibition for years in several individual states, has finally adopted the policy throughout its entire area. Representatives from the United States offer ample evidence that this policy has already resulted in a marked decrease in the population of penal and charitable institutions, in the number of cases coming before the police and criminal courts, and in the demand upon rescue work. There is also an improvement in economic and industrial conditions, and above all in the stability of the home, the integrity of the family, and the welfare of children. The question is being so seriously considered in the Dominion of Canada that, with the exception of Quebec, all the provinces are at present under prohibitory law.

In New Zealand, Dominion prohibition was lost at a recent poll by a small majority. There is a strong feeling in that country that the elimination of the drink traffic would contribute to the efficiency and morality of the Dominion. It is a significant fact that no area in which prohibition has been carried on the three-fifths majority basis has gone back from its previous decision.

In respect to the native races, we urge that the policy of prohibiting the importation of liquor should be strongly enforced, and that all social customs leading to the formation or increase of the drink habit amongst the natives be condemned as being especially dangerous to them. The trade in liquor with these defenceless people is one of the most disastrous instances of the exploiting of the weaker for the financial benefit of the stronger.

We earnestly hope that paragraph 5, Article XXII., of the Covenant of the League of Nations referring "to the prohibition of abuses such as the slave trade, the arms traffic, and the liquor traffic," will be expanded into definite provisions and speedily put into operation both as regards mandatory and general areas.

In regard to the United Kingdom, the Committee contents itself with a quotation from the Report of the Royal Commission on the Licensing Laws :—

> "It is undeniable that a gigantic evil remains to be remedied, and hardly any sacrifice would be too great which would result in a marked diminution of this national degradation."

That no adequate sacrifice has yet been made is evidenced by the fact that last year £386,600,000 was spent in the United

Kingdom on strong drink. Under the restrictions imposed by the Board of Control during the war, the situation greatly improved. Since these have been in part removed, there has been a distinct relapse.

In the United Kingdom one of the chief hindrances to progress is the inability of those who are most earnest in promoting temperance reform to come to an agreement as to the best line of advance. All the English bishops on this committee are agreed on the desirability, for the United Kingdom, of fuller State control, of local option, and of the reform of public-houses: as regards State-purchase and prohibition there is difference of opinion among them.

In conclusion, we desire, with all the strength and earnestness which we possess, to urge upon our fellow Churchmen in every part of the world the imperative importance of giving the gravest consideration to the entire question of intemperance. We would add further that, whilst all are not agreed upon the duty of total abstinence from intoxicating liquor as a beverage, there is no room for doubt that such abstinence for the sake of others, and as a contribution to the stability of our industrial and social life, is a splendid privilege of Christian service.

III.

Our Primary Duty.

The primary duty of the Church (by which we mean the whole society of Christian men) is to witness to the principles of Christ and His Kingdom. The work of this Committee in setting forth those principles is greatly lightened by the recent publication of the Report of the Archbishops' Committee on Christianity and Industrial Problems (S.P.C.K. 1918). With the opinions and suggestions of that Report this Committee finds itself substantially in agreement. They would, however, desire to emphasize the fact that while individual members of, or special groups within, the Church may rightly advocate some specific programme or policy, the Church should never, as a Body, concern itself with a political issue unless it involves a clear moral issue, and then only in the interest of morals and righteousness, and not in the interest of parties. On many industrial questions there is need for frank co-operation with the economist, and it is hardly necessary to state that, if material wealth is regarded not as an end but as a means, we must submit ourselves to scientific investigation of the processes that govern the production of wealth and the methods which guide us in its distribution. But we cannot accept the theory, which indeed is repudiated by modern economists, that man is to be regarded as a merely acquisitive animal. We desire to re-affirm the finding of the 1897 Committee: "Christian

opinion ought to condemn the belief that economic conditions are to be left to the action of material causes and mechanical laws, uncontrolled by any moral responsibility." There is indeed a constant need for students of economy who will investigate these problems scientifically from a Christian standpoint. It will frequently be found that scientific economics require reinforcement by Christian ethics.

Two illustrations may be given.

(1) The great economic need of the present time is more production. It is for the economist to shew the disastrous fallacy of limitation of output. But the workman needs to be assured first that the right things are produced—things which contribute to beauty or to use, not superfluous futilities—and secondly, that the wealth which is produced will be justly distributed and devoted to the public good. If the workman is asked to sacrifice the interests of his class to the interests of the whole community, he needs to be convinced that the whole community is really going to reap the benefit of his labour. It is clear that bare economics will not take us to the goal. Mr. Hoover was right when he said that something like a spiritual revival is required if the industrial problem of production is to be solved.

(2) There is no economic question more important than that of the nature and function of capital. But it is an unreal abstraction which treats capital as possessing laws and movements of its own apart from the people who control it. For the use of capital, persons are responsible, and, if they are Christians, they cannot be satisfied with mere consideration of security and profit. So long as the materialistic point of view is paramount, class war is inevitable. If there is to be industrial peace we need the outlook and the motive which are supplied by our Christian Faith.

We turn then to those great principles which represent the Christian law of righteousness and love.

(1) *Human Value.*—As God is our Father, and as the Eternal Son of God took our whole human nature upon Him, every son and daughter of God is of infinite and equal value. There are wide differences in capacity, but such differences do not warrant any loss of liberty or any failure to give to all the children of God the opportunity of a full human life. Life must always count for more than property, the possession of which ought always to answer to some function duly performed. Therefore we are bound to condemn any system which regards men or women as mere instruments for the production of wealth. Obviously in any organized system there must be discipline: but that discipline should be the discipline of free men, arising from the common mind, and embodying the common will. If a man is

always expressing the ideals of others, with never a chance to express his own, his personality is denied its full development. Whether or no the demand for the full "democratizing of industry" is practicable or even reasonable, it is at least clear that the workers in an industry ought to have an adequate share in the control of the conditions under which their work—a large portion of their life—is carried on.

As a means of attaining this reasonable control, perfect freedom of organization on the part of workers, with leaders and spokesmen of their own choosing, must be upheld. Although this principle is accepted in England as an accomplished fact, it is evident that in some countries represented in this Conference there is need to bear witness to its reasonableness. If Trade-Unionism is liable to abuse—a danger which inheres in the exercise of all new-found power—it involves a valuable process of education. We invoke the principle of mutual respect, and the God-given grace of good-will, for managers of industry and likewise for the army of workers, that their separate organizations, through the willingness to look not only on their own things, but also on the things of others, may in God's time and in His own way be transcended in a larger fellowship.

This principle of human value also has a direct bearing on the vast subject of education. Our boys and girls should be trained not merely to be efficient producers of wealth, but to be their true selves, completely developed in body, mind, and spirit, so that they may give their full service to God and their fellows. Seeing that such education needs a lifetime for its fulfilment, we must warmly welcome every plan for its continuance, and aim not merely at a "ladder" for a few fortunate boys and girls, but at a highway which will open the best education in the country to all who are capable of profiting by it. With regard to adult education, such efforts as those of the Workers' Educational Association deserve the most earnest support.

Among the manifold tasks which this Conference has taken in hand it has been found impossible to include any special report on the subject of religious education—a subject which was dealt with very fully at the last Conference. All the more, therefore, do we feel constrained, in any treatment of the social duty of the Church, to insist that it must refuse to rest content until genuine religious teaching is recognized as a vital part of education.

(2) The principle of human value, with its insistence on the worth of the individual, needs for its complement the principle of *human brotherhood*, which teaches us that we are members one of another. The Incarnation broke down the ancient barriers. Differences of race, of class, of sex, are transcended: "we are one man in Christ Jesus."

The corollary of this principle of brotherhood, in relation to our industrial system, is that we must regard industry, not chiefly as a

means of private profit or class advantage, but as an opportunity of service "for the glory of God and the good of man's estate." To quote Mr. W. L. Hichens: "Unless industry is really recognized as primarily a national service, in which each individual is fulfilling his function to the best of his ability for the sake of the community, in which private gain is subordinated to public good, in which, in a word, we carry out our duty towards our neighbour—unless we build on this foundation, there is no hope of creating the House Beautiful. If each man thinks of making his pile by all the means that economic individualism allows, if class bands itself against class, trade union against employers' federation, firm against firm, to secure the greatest share of the world's goods in unrestricted competition, social life must inevitably break down and anarchy reign supreme."

Now, so long as the present wage system lasts, there are certain lines of reform which, by almost universal confession, ought to be followed.

(a) *Security against Unemployment.*

It is beyond our compass to discuss methods of solving this troublesome problem. The difficulties are notoriously great, but it is certain that nothing is more fruitful of unrest than a haunting sense of insecurity in the mind of the workers: it cannot be right that a workman should be regarded as a mere tool to be scrapped when not required for another's use, and it is an offence to the conscience of a Christian community that men who are able and willing to work should be forced into idleness.

(b) *Reasonable Leisure.*

The constant subdivision of labour and the increasing use of machinery are an inevitable cause of wearisome monotony in the labour of many industrial workers. "The idea of the leisured classes and the toiling masses is monstrous: it is just the toiling drudge who needs leisure most—leisure for recreation and refreshment, leisure for education—above all, leisure for education." *

In some countries, however, where there is a large increase in the amount of leisure enjoyed by the worker, there is need of real help in ensuring that such leisure may be used for the happiness and good of all concerned, and such help may well be offered by the Church.

(c) *A Living Wage.*

We reaffirm the principle commended in an appendix to the 1908 Report. "The Christian Church, which holds that the

* Mr. W. L. Hichens, "Some Problems of Modern Industry."

individual life is sacred, must teach that it is intolerable to it that any part of our industry should be organised upon the foundation of the misery and want of the labourer. The fundamental Christian principle of the remuneration of labour is that the first charge upon any industry must be the proper maintenance of the labourer—an idea which it has been sought to express in popular language by the phrase 'the living wage.'"

This must not be interpreted as a bare subsistence wage. There must be sufficient to live a decent and complete, a cleanly and noble life.

(d) *Safeguards to Life and Health.*

"The Church should also urge upon its members the moral, as distinct from the legal, obligation of providing and making efficient whatever in the way of apparatus or arrangements is necessary to safeguard the life and health of the worker."

But there is a further question which has to be faced. While it is our immediate duty to remove, so far as may be, everything in the existing system which is an offence against liberty and brotherhood, we are also forced to ask whether the present system is compatible with the law of Christ. Bishop Westcott said quite plainly: "Wage labour, though it appears to be an inevitable step in the evolution of society, is as little fitted to represent finally or adequately the connection of man with man in the production of wealth as, in earlier times, slavery or serfdom." Two characteristics of the order to which the wage system belongs are the pursuit of self-interest and the prevalence of unrestricted competition. Now self-interest has a legitimate, though always a subordinate, place in Christian ethics; and competition, not for mere gain but for the fulfilment of duty in the best possible way, is a reasonable incentive to efficiency. It is foolish to despise individual enterprise and unduly to fetter individual liberty. But the dominant principle in a rightly ordered society will be co-operation for the common good rather than competition for private advantage. It cannot be said that this principle rules our present system. No doubt it will be urged that if the motives which support the present order are removed, the whole industrial system is in danger of collapsing. But as Christians we cannot accept the assumption that men will only be induced to work by the incentive of large gain or by the stimulus of imminent personal want. It was a higher motive that led men and women to offer their devoted service, often at the cost of sacrificing life itself, during the years of war. Is it wholly incredible that such motives may be forthcoming in time of peace?

It certainly would seem that the principle laid down by Dr. Headlam (in the course of a trenchant criticism of the Report

of the Archbishops' Committee on "Christianity and Industrial Problems"), "the substitution of a strong spirit of brotherhood for a spirit of competition or rivalry," must lead us to a profound dissatisfaction with the existing order; nor do we dispute his warning "to meddle as little as possible, as a Church, with definite political or economic issues," if it is rightly interpreted.

It is, in fact, not our business to pronounce on the respective merits of rival methods for creating a better order, *e.g.*, "Nationalization," or "Guild Socialism," or "Labour co-partnership." Nor again do we for a moment utter any general condemnation of the captains of industry who have had the main responsibility for working our present system. It is superfluous to say that many of them have been and are men of the highest integrity and honour, whose chief motive has not been mere pursuit of gain, but who have sought to render good service to the community, and, in rendering it, to exercise the most scrupulous care for the welfare of the employees.

But we repeat that co-operation for the common good is the goal towards which the industrial journey of society should be directed. That goal can never be reached by violent revolution. Mr. Bertrand Russell (himself not adverse to communism) has written: "The damage to civilization done by revolution in one country may be repaid by the influence of another, in which there has been no revolution, but in a universal cataclysm civilization might go under for 1,000 years."

Perhaps we shall not be transgressing our limitations if we suggest that the next line of advance towards the expression of brotherhood in industry is to be found in those industrial parliaments, where employers and employed meet on absolutely equal terms, of which the English building trade affords a notable example. The condition of their success is open confidence, frank goodwill, and the determination, on both sides, to keep all promises and fulfil all undertakings.

(3) From the principle of human brotherhood we pass to that of *human responsibility*. God trusts us. We are responsible for the right use of our capacities and endowments, and we are responsible for one another. All that belongs to us is held in trust: no property can be our absolute and unconditional possession. This is true also of our powers and faculties of body and mind. These powers are entrusted to us by God in order that we may use them for His service and the good of our fellows: the duty of honest work, to the uttermost of our ability, is binding upon all, and we cannot, without moral deterioration, rest content with less than our best work. The idler or the shirker, to whatever class of society he belongs, is false to his trust. It is true that a labourer is worthy of his hire; it is equally true that the worker ought to do an honest day's work: the

policy of 'ca' canny' or 'go slow' cannot be morally justified: on the other hand, those whose work is "unproductive" of material wealth are specially bound to give good value to society in return for the benefits which society confers on them.

The principle of responsibility covers our relation to each other. A man is his "brother's keeper"; the public is responsible for industrial conditions, and the selfishness of the consumer is at least as pronounced as the selfishness of the producer; moreover, in our complex civilization, the whole community is responsible for the conditions under which any section of it is compelled to live. It is true enough that in the abnormal conditions of our time problems like that of housing may baffle even the most resolute efforts. But it is a reproach to our Christian civilization that we have tolerated, both in town and country, slums and unsanitary dwellings which have caused an appalling mortality among little children, and have been plague spots of disease and moral evil. "Overcrowding," said Sir Charles Booth, "is the most fruitful cause of drunkenness and vice." Even where the worst features of the slum have been absent, we have allowed our industrial towns to become a mean wilderness of hideous streets. Almost everywhere the miserably inadequate supply of houses leads to the gravest moral difficulty and danger. The way of remedy is hard to find, but our conscience cannot be easy until we have found it.

Before we pass to the suggestion of various lines of action in the Church to-day, we may briefly sum up the position at which we have arrived.

Because God is our Father, all His children are of infinite value. To each of His children should be given the best possible opportunity of a full human life: life must count for more than property, and no human being ought ever to be used for less than a human purpose.

Because all men are brothers of Jesus Christ, all artificial barriers must be broken down. Where there is true brotherhood men will work together in service for the common good: they will cease to strive one against another for mere private advantage.

Because God trusts us, we are responsible for all that we possess, and we are responsible for the care of each other. "If one member suffer, all the members suffer with it." The reform of evil conditions—such as bad housing—is the business of the whole body.

The fulfilment of these principles must lead to something better than a "tinkering scheme of piecemeal reform." Yet it is not by violent revolution, but by a complete change of mind and will that a better order can be reached. So far as the immediate future is concerned, it is possible to take steps without

delay to meet the evils of unemployment, and to secure for all workers a living wage, reasonable leisure, and a share in the control of the conditions in which their working life is spent.

IV.

How to Fulfil our Duty.

(1) The bare statement of these principles shews us the truth in Mr. Chesterton's dictum, "Christianity has been found difficult and has not been tried." Most of us have grave cause for repentance. We have failed to give faithful witness in our teaching: we have failed even more signally to give witness *by our life*. Here, surely, is our first duty. It was the life of the early Christians which won victories for Christ. It is the life of Christians which will do most to further His Kingdom in the society of to-day. Members of the Christian Church must repudiate the standards of the world. They must "take heed and beware of covetousness." It ought not to be possible to say that many of them are as unscrupulous as any pagan in exploiting their own economic advantage. A Christian will repudiate the maxim that "business is business"—the equivalent in industry of the Prussian maxim, "war is war." His sense of honour will be as keen in his commercial dealings as in his personal intercourse: he will think about his duties before he thinks about his rights: he will be courteous, considerate, and kindly towards all, whether they are supposed to belong to a "higher" or "lower" grade in society: he will be scrupulously careful about the nature of his investments, and will avoid expenditure which merely tends to vulgar display or selfish indulgence: he will honour a man, not for his success in making money, but for his service to the common good: his ambition for himself and his children will be the contribution of useful service to the community, not the attainment of wealth or social position. The witness of his life will, in a word, be the witness of one who tries to follow the Christian law of love.

(2) The witness of the individual will be reinforced if the whole Church is, what it ought to be, a warm-hearted brotherly fellowship. In the New Testament "philadelphia," love for members of the Christian community, was the necessary precursor of "agape," love of all men for Christ's sake. It was not in irony that the heathen said, "see how these Christians love one another." In the early Church it was recognized that a brother must be helped to find employment. If he was unable to work he was provided with support. If he would not work "neither should he eat." Class distinctions were no barrier: the man of noble birth believed in and acted on his brotherhood with the despised slave at whose side he had received his communion.

No one can pretend that this is true of the Church to-day. Class consciousness is rampant in every grade of society. In many of our churches the arrangement of " sittings " would incur the condemnation of St. James. Can we not determine to get rid once for all of unbrotherly aloofness, and to abolish the misinterpretation of the Church Catechism which represents " my betters " as meaning " social superiors."

There are signs of improvement. For example, men and women of all classes are taking their places in our various Church Councils. But we need to make careful provision to open the door wide for representatives of the industrial class.

We may be thankful, also, that we are well on the road to carry out some recommendations of the " Moral Witness" Committee of the 1908 Conference :—

> " It is of the greatest importance, therefore . . . that the Church of Christ, if it is to win the confidence of the democracy, should show its readiness to set its own house in order ; to model its own system of government on a sound, representative, and democratic basis ; to restore the ministry of the laity to its legitimate place and power in Church government and discipline ; to exhibit such business capabilities in the administration of Church finance as shall at least provide adequate stipends and pensions for its clergy, reapportion and readjust where necessary existing resources for this purpose, furnish sufficient funds for the upkeep of Church fabrics and for the organisation of the charitable and philanthropic institutions of the Church ; and, above all, to make impossible the abuses too often connected with Church patronage."

It may be added that we ought to do our utmost to further the efforts already made to enable men of all classes, whose vocation and capacity are proved, to receive the necessary training for the Ministry of the Church. Experience in connection with Service Candidates is full of encouragement.

(3) Another recommendation of previous Conferences has been only partially followed, viz., *Association within the Anglican Communion for study and for practical social work.* It is greatly to be desired that a Social Service Committee should be established in each diocese, with branches, if possible, in every congregation, and other parts of the Church might well follow the example of Canada and the U.S.A. by forming a Council which should act for the whole Church and watch for special social needs and opportunities. As regards England, reference may here be made to the work of the Christian Social Union and the Industrial Christian Fellowship, which have now been fused into one society, the purpose of which is to further the Kingdom of God in social and industrial life, and, in its presentation of the Gospel message to those engaged in industry, to shew the full application of Christianity to social life and practice.

(4) But there is need for *wider association with other Christians in social witness and service.* It belongs to another Committee

to deal with the anxious problems of reunion among Christians; but, whatever be the delays in the restoration of communion upon doctrinal and sacramental grounds, we believe that there are no principles at stake which can rightly be held to hinder all denominations of Christians from beginning without any delay to act as if they were wholly one body in the department of public, moral, and social witness. We dare, further, to affirm that nothing serves better to promote the deeper sort of union than the mutual knowledge engendered by working closely together in social service; and also that, short of the witness of full sacramental union, there can be no more impressive witness for Christianity than the spectacle of a Christendom re-united so far as to be able to stand together for the application of the principles of justice and brotherhood in society and industry. We ought to add that we are thinking not only or chiefly of Central Committees, of conspicuous religious leaders in great capital cities, but local councils gathering in each centre of population the representatives of all the Christian congregations of the locality. Already considerable progress has been made in many towns of the British Empire and the U.S.A. Civic guilds or social service councils or community centres have been formed for the purpose of detecting abuses which need reform, of focusing a sound public opinion, of supporting the municipal authorities in the pursuit not of sectional interests, but of the common good, and of furthering every kind of useful social work. The Christian Social Crusade in England, and corresponding organizations in other countries, have done much to promote this purpose. In many cases the inter-denominational guild has formed close alliances with Labour and other movements, which aim at a better social order.

(5) The Church should be a *reservoir of social service.* There is a large and almost infinitely varied field of service both for men and women who will find the vocation of their life in social ministry, and for those who are able only to devote their leisure to it. Welfare work of all kinds, after-care committees for school-children, club work, study circles, and other efforts to promote fellowship and utilize leisure—these are only specimens of an enormous choice of opportunities.* Special reference may here be made to the work of the Church Army for lifting up those who are down. While there is great need of men and

* It is hardly necessary to add that any form of social service deserves to be taken seriously with a full sense of its responsibility, and careful training is required. We would urge that in any scheme of training in economics, theology should find a place, in order that its true motive-power for the work may be given. Most of the Universities have now agreed to accept Theology as one of their optional subjects.

Very useful suggestions are given in "The Church and Social Service," Report of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Committee (S.P.C.K., 1920).

women who will give themselves to the distinctively pastoral and evangelistic lay ministry of the Church, it should be emphasized that all work of social welfare, undertaken from the right motive and in the right spirit, is "Church work." The Recruiting Campaign for Service in the Kingdom of God has laid stress on the close connection between Missionary and Social Service. It is earnestly to be hoped that the splendid devotion shewn by countless men and women during the war may find a new and even greater opportunity, in working along different but converging roads towards the establishment of righteousness, fellowship, and love between the nations and within the nations of the world.

V.

The Root of the Matter.

We have suggested various lines of action which, we feel assured, it is our duty to follow, if we are to arrive at that better social and industrial order which we believe to be in accordance with God's will. But we desire to affirm, with unwavering conviction, that no outward adjustments can, by themselves, bring us near to the Kingdom of God. The love which conquers selfishness, and the passion for righteousness which drives out greed, are gifts from above, and, unless selfishness and greed are vanquished, the most perfectly devised co-operative commonwealth will perish in ignoble ruin. There is doubtless a narrow other-worldliness which seeks a selfish security in another life, but the principles and powers of the other world offer the only hope of redemption for the individual and for society. Man has an eternal destiny, and his whole nature is therefore of infinite worth. To uplift humanity, and to redeem every child of man, the Son of God came into this world. By His Incarnation He gave us the complete revelation of human duty. By His Cross and Passion He taught us the true value of life and death, and opened that way of fellowship with God, without which there can be no real fellowship of man with man. By the power of His Resurrection and the living inspiration of His Spirit, the ultimate victory will be won: and the Church which is His Body can go forward, with confident hope, to fulfil by prayer and work and witness its Mission of seeking that Kingdom of love and righteousness which He will one day reveal in its perfect beauty.

(Signed) J. A. LICHFIELD,
Chairman.

No. III.

Report of the Committee† Appointed to Consider and Report upon the Subject of the Development of Provinces in the Anglican Communion.

"If the Anglican Communion is to render that service to the varied needs of mankind to which the Church of our day is specially called, regard must be had both to the just freedom of its several parts, and to the just claims of the whole Communion upon its every part." It is in the spirit of these words, quoted from the Encyclical Letter of the Lambeth Conference of 1908, that your Committee on the "Development of Provinces in the Anglican Communion" has tried to act, and to make some suggestions. It recognizes the fact that in the Lambeth Conference of 1867 the system of provincial organization was primarily laid down. It recognizes, too, that on the principles of the system then laid down such organization has been carried out in various parts of the world. It feels consequently that its special work this year is to deal with the development of that system, in the Church as it exists to-day, with the view of making that organization more complete and effective.

† Names of Members of the Committee:—

Bishop of Accra
Bishop of Ballarat*
Bishop Hamilton Baynes (*Secretary*)
Bishop of Brechin (Primus)*
Archbishop of Brisbane
Bishop of Bunbury
Archbishop of Capetown (*Chairman*)
Bishop of Chekiang
Bishop of Christchurch
Bishop of Colombo
Bishop of George
Bishop of Gibraltar
Bishop of Goulburn
Bishop of Grantham
Bishop of Honduras
Bishop of Jamaica
Bishop of Kalgoorlie
Bishop of Lagos
Bishop of Manchester
Bishop of Massachusetts
Archbishop of Melbourne*
Bishop of Newfoundland
Bishop of New Jersey
Bishop in North China
Bishop of Northern Rhodesia
Archbishop of Nova Scotia
Bishop of Ohio
Bishop of Oklahoma
Bishop of Osaka
Bishop Osborne
Bishop of Richmond
Bishop of Rochester
Archbishop of Rupert's Land
Bishop of St. Helena
Bishop in Shantung
Bishop of Uganda*
Archbishop of the West Indies
Bishop of Worcester
Bishop of Zanzibar

In the first place your Committee has learnt that a considerable number of Dioceses, now amounting to 31, have been established in many parts of the world, which are not as yet included in any sort of provincial organization of their own.*

This is a sign of growth for which there is cause for much thankfulness: but at the same time it is evident that if these Dioceses were grouped into provincial organizations such grouping would tend to the health and strength not only of those Dioceses immediately concerned but of the Church in general.

Your Committee therefore suggests that whenever and wherever it may be possible, new Provinces be created, and that Dioceses now working in isolation be encouraged to attach themselves to some existing Province or to form a new Province. Your Committee is aware that many of these Dioceses are of a purely missionary character, and consequently it seems necessary to point out that the one organization which is essential to provincial life is a House or College of Bishops. Your Committee suggests that it is advisable in any newly-constituted Provincial Synod for the Bishops to associate with themselves the Clergy and Laity of the Province as soon as may be. When, however, local circumstances make such association impracticable, this need be no hindrance to the initiation of a provincial organization.

In such cases each National or Regional Church or Province would necessarily determine its own constitutional and canonical enactments. Its Bishops would take an oath of Canonical obedience to the new Metropolitan of the Province or of conformity to such other Authority as may be constitutionally appointed. This would refer to all Bishops, both those already working in the newly-constituted Province and those who shall be thereafter consecrated for work in any See within the provincial area. In order to comply with the Canonical rule for the consecration of a Bishop within the Province, your Committee suggests that in the formation of a new Province a minimum of four Dioceses shall be required.

Questions relating to the appointment of Bishops must be left to the newly-constituted Province to decide, but the Committee suggests that in the election of a Metropolitan, the Province as well as the Diocese should have a real and distinct voice.

In respect to problems of race and language, which have been brought before it, the Committee feels that these are

* Your Committee is glad to learn that there would seem to be an immediate prospect of the branches of our Communion in China and Japan obtaining full advantage of any rights attaching to provincial organization, and further of the possible formation of new Provinces among the Dioceses of East and West Africa.

matters which must be left to the various Provinces or Regional Churches to settle, but it would lay down one distinct principle, namely, that in every Province there can be but one Church and one Authority.

Your Committee is of opinion that the position of the Consultative Body of the Lambeth Conference should be strengthened. It consequently expresses the hope, first, that all parts of the Anglican Communion may see their way to nominate representatives on that Body, so that it may be representative of the whole Church ; secondly, that this Consultative Body may be increasingly regarded as a real living Body, to which any question of Faith and Order may be referred, as an authority of great moral weight, providing a voluntary nexus for the whole of the Anglican Communion though possessing no power to enforce its decisions. That this was the intention of the establishment of the Consultative Body there cannot be a doubt, and your Committee feels that it may help towards this end if its constitution and functions are reasserted at this Conference.

It also suggests that while the manner of appointment of members of this Body must be left to the various Provinces or Churches, members should be appointed for a period of not more than five years.

As one question of wide concern which the Consultative Body might profitably consider the Committee suggests the Colonial Clergy Act and its possible modification.

NOTE.—In the foregoing Report the Conference has had chiefly in view the formation of Provinces by the synthesis of isolated Dioceses not by the sub-division of National Churches as in the United States of America.

(Signed) WILLIAM M. CAPETOWN,
Chairman.

No. IV.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE † APPOINTED TO CONSIDER AND REPORT UPON "MISSIONARY PROBLEMS": (*a*) MISSIONS AND GOVERNMENTS; (*b*) MISSIONS AND GROWING CHURCHES; (*c*) LITURGICAL VARIATIONS; (*d*) MARRIAGE QUESTIONS.

THE MISSIONARY CALL.

OUR Blessed Lord has made it the duty of every one of His people no less than of the Church at large or her leaders, to see that His Kingdom is extended by making disciples of all nations, and established by training them in His laws. The building up in holiness of existing congregations, and the winning of new ones, are two parts of one task, never to be separated. Each is necessary to the other. The older Church must be purified and quickened, if it is to be capable of its evangelistic function;

† Names of Members of the Committee:—

Bishop of Antigua
Bishop of Athabasca
Bishop of Auckland
Bishop of Bendigo
Bishop of Buckingham
Bishop of Calcutta (*Chairman*)
Archbishop of Capetown
Bishop of Carpentaria
Bishop of Chekiang
Bishop of Clogher
Bishop Copleston
Bishop in Corea
Bishop of Dornakal
Bishop of Exeter
Bishop of Falkland Isles
Bishop of Fukien
Bishop of Gippsland
Bishop of Grantham
Bishop of Hankow
Bishop of Honan
Bishop of Honduras.
Bishop Ingham
Bishop of Kimberley
Bishop King
Bishop of Kwangsi
Bishop of Lagos
Bishop of Long Island
Bishop of Mackenzie River
Bishop of Moosonee
Bishop of Newark
Bishop of New Guinea
Bishop of New Mexico
Bishop in North China
Bishop of North Queensland
Bishop of Northern Rhodesia
Bishop of North Texas
Bishop of Nyasaland (*Secretary*)
Bishop Oluwole
Bishop in Persia
Bishop Price
Bishop Roach
Bishop of St. John's
Bishop of Saskatchewan
Bishop of Singapore
Bishop of South Dakota
Bishop of Southern Rhodesia
Bishop in South Tokyo
Bishop in Tinnevelly
Bishop of Tokyo
Bishop of Western China
Bishop of West Missouri
Bishop of Zululand

and the exercise of that function is a condition of its health. It is always found that the Church or the Parish in which the missionary spirit is most active is the most abundantly enriched with all spiritual blessings. There is no question here of a Home Department and a Foreign Department. This is not a counsel of perfection. It is implicit in discipleship itself; it cannot rightly be evaded.

Yet we confess with shame that the prayers and efforts which belong to the missionary spirit still fall far short—in spite of real and increasing improvement—of what loyalty and love to Christ demand. Bishops and Parish Priests must preach this duty more constantly: the public prayers must be full of it: in every council of the Church, from the Parish to the General Synod, it must hold a conspicuous place among the Agenda: it must be among the cherished aims of every Christian home, of every Christian heart. For it is unreasonable that men should claim a place in the fellowship of the Church unless they are ready to share this obligation, which the Lord laid upon all disciples, at all times, in all places, amid all ordinary occupations as well as by direct evangelization, to be witnesses for Him.

The aim that all His members must set before themselves may be quite simply stated thus: World-wide witness to the Lord. This does not necessarily mean immediate world conversion; but it does mean adding to the Church daily such as are being saved. We aim immediately at the planting of Church life and order in all lands, at the formation of Churches, not only the conversion of individuals; Churches which from the very first shall be active centres of evangelization; at extending not the Anglican Church with its special characteristics, but the Holy Catholic Church in its essentials, which each new Church, as it grows up, may exhibit under characteristics of its own. Ultimately, we aim at all that is hoped for in the coming of the Kingdom of God.

Home Organization.

We enquire then what are the methods actually in use, in our dioceses and congregations, to rally all hearts to prayer and self-sacrifice, to kindle in the whole Body this missionary temper, and to secure its fullest expression and efficiency as a missionary force. We find, to speak generally, two distinct, but not quite incompatible, methods: one, that which the newer Churches have almost universally adopted, as in itself the normal way, and arising out of the nature of the Church; namely, the method by which the whole Body is so "organized for Missions," that one current of enthusiasm and activity flows through and out of every member, every group and every individual; the other,

that in which, as the gradual result of various circumstances in the older Churches, certain great chartered Societies, and other Associations of Churchmen, have acted as specialized channels, through which the energy of the Body has found itself flowing.

In the Churches which are organized for Missions (for instance, in the United States and in Canada), the whole Body is one missionary organ: great decisions are made in full Synod, and the immediate executive is in the hands of a Board or Committee, over which the Synod or Convention is ultimately supreme. In some cases the financial obligation is distributed by the central authority among dioceses and parishes, by a system of apportionment or assessment: this method of assessment, though it is not everywhere at first popular, is on the whole, we are told, effective. This organization for Missions, to which the large English-speaking Churches have come completely or in part, is being adopted spontaneously and, so to speak, instinctively by the indigenous Churches of other races; in the dioceses, for instance, of Uganda, of Nigeria, of Dornakal; in the Churches of our Communion in Japan and China (the Nippon Sei Kokwai and the Chung-hua Sheng Kung Hui). Sometimes the diocese, sometimes the Province, is the unit, but in all such cases the initiative and the control are synodical.

The system which we have called the normal method is probably admitted on all hands to be in itself the better; but it is not to be expected, or even to be desired, that it should be suddenly adopted by all. Where the method of Society organization exists, we recommend that it should be used to the full. We believe that it can be used to the full within a Church which is itself, as a Church, conscious of its own corporate mission. Societies are already working in co-operation with Synods, or in subordination to them. A central Advisory Council may guide, or wisely influence, all the agencies by which zeal is aroused, funds collected, and workers recruited, and may direct their associated energies to the needs of the enterprises, which from time to time are seen to be most urgent or most hopeful.

In England, some such co-ordination of agencies has been aimed at—but on a small scale, and tentatively—by the Central Board of Missions. That Board exists in order to represent and express the mind of the Church in respect to its work overseas. Its constitution is framed with the view of giving to Missions overseas their rightful place as a primary activity of the whole Church, and in its present form it was formally adopted by the Convocations of Canterbury and York and by the Houses of Laymen of both Provinces—these bodies themselves all meeting together in what was the Representative Church Council. The creation of the National Assembly of the Church of England with statutory powers, able to give expression to the voice of

the Church on all matters which concern it, has produced a new condition. If the National Assembly is to fulfil its purpose, it must give an important place to that which is accepted as a primary activity of the Church, and must make itself responsible for expressing the mind of the Church in all that belongs to its overseas work. With this in view, it is desirable that the Central Board of Missions should be brought under the control of the National Assembly, from which it should receive its authority, and that the National Assembly should give in its deliberations a definite place to the Report of the Board—a place at least equal in importance to that of the other matters with which it deals. The decisions, recommendations and appeals would go forth as those not of a Board but of the Church itself.

We urge that it is of the utmost importance that this task should be taken up by the National Assembly from its first inception; that it should be assumed as one of its normal and most precious functions; that the Assembly should claim, from the first, and as a whole, to be the supreme missionary authority, superseding none but embracing and co-ordinating all.

Our limits do not allow us to deal with those essential parts of the Home Church's work, for the sake of which the organizations we have been treating of exist. Of financial methods and necessities, we can here say nothing. In reference to the supply of workers, we note with thankfulness what has been done or set going in English dioceses by "the Recruiting Campaign." Besides men and women already recruited and sent to dioceses overseas, a large number of the Clergy have been enrolled as recognizing the principle of the oneness of the Ministry whether overseas or at home, and as pledging themselves to give equal consideration to calls which may come to them from either part of the One Field.

The need of clergy is urgent in some Colonial Dioceses whose large districts are being rapidly peopled, and the Conference should earnestly appeal to men in Great Britain to volunteer for pioneer work as well as to the men of the Churches in those lands to give themselves to the service of God in their own country.

We cannot leave unmentioned the paramount importance of missionary Study; and in particular we desire to emphasize the value of information collected and brought within the reach of all, concerning what each separate agency is doing or planning. Such information should include the work of missionaries of other communions than our own. Finally, we acknowledge—sure that such acknowledgements can never be mere platitudes—that the One Agent of all missionary operations is the Holy Spirit of God, and that the largest contribution any man or woman can make to this Cause is that which is made by loving, faith l and persevering Prayer; he who truly gives this will not long keep back anything that he has.

Missions and Growing Churches.

In reviewing the development of Missions into indigenous self-governing Churches in non-Christian lands, we are confronted with so much diversity, that it is extremely difficult to generalize. Some Dioceses have from the first developed their organization on the lines recommended below; others have of late years been taking steps in a similar direction.

At the outset we wish to place on record our appreciation of the work of Missionary Societies and Boards of Missions. Their great progress has made their aim of establishing self-governing, self-supporting, and self-extending Churches, and themselves withdrawing from control and pushing their work further afield, possible in many mission fields at the present time.

The Committee therefore makes the following suggestions as to the immediate steps which should be taken to achieve this object.

Development of Local Churches.

I. There is in many missions a tendency to make the work centre in the Mission organization rather than in the Church. We would therefore urge that from the very beginning, the Mission staff should develop the Church consciousness of their people by the creation of consultative and executive councils in parish and district: and further, that such councils should as soon as possible find their place in a definite Diocesan system.

It is moreover important that all missionary committees and councils should as soon as possible be thoroughly representative of the congregations whose affairs they administer, instead of being, as is sometimes the case, predominantly representative of the subscribers to the mission alone: and further that care should be taken to avoid over-centralization of authority, or over-refinement of rules and procedure, both of which have been shewn by experience to retard the development of the corporate life of local churches.

II. The question of the management of the finances which the Missionary Societies supply to the local Church is one of some delicacy. The principle that the provision of funds by a Society at home carries with it an inherent right to full control in the Mission has now been largely abandoned. But on the other hand, the Missionary Societies and Boards not unnaturally claim that they cannot be deprived of all share in the regulation of the work to which they contribute. The exact adjustment of the two claims will vary according to the progress of the Church which receives help. But we desire to express our conviction that an increasing share in the management of finance

will call forth increased gifts from the indigenous churches, and will do more than anything else to strengthen their sense of responsibility and power of self-government. We therefore urge the Missionary Societies and Boards to review their organization with a view to developing as generous a financial policy as possible. And we confidently appeal to the indigenous churches to respond with self-sacrifice and zealous work, in the matter of the support of their own parishes as well as in the wider work of the Church.

III. The Committee cannot but view with concern the widespread reluctance of those who should be the natural leaders of the churches abroad, to find their life's work in the ministries of the Church. From many mission lands we hear the testimony that the organization of Mission and Church is conceived on lines so foreign, and the opportunities for a life of such service as shall be the natural and full expression of national gifts are so limited, that the best men are fain to turn to other walks of life.

We feel that the fault too often lies in the system which cannot find a congenial sphere for such men. They are conscious of membership in the Body of Christ, but they find scant opportunity of bringing their best to the service of the Body.

We would strongly urge that both Missions and Dioceses should do their utmost so to organize their work that the widest freedom may be given for the development of the national and individual gifts of all who are called to the service of God and of His Church.

IV. Among the many problems which arise in carrying out any large transference of the centre of authority from the Mission to the Diocese, one stands out as peculiarly difficult : the settlement of a Diocese in which Europeans and indigenous congregations exist side by side in one area. We are clear that Catholic principle traditionally demands the territorial bishopric. But in such cases we must recognize that the marked differences of ideal and discipline, language and mentality demand that provision should be made in the one Synod or Province for the utmost freedom of development of the races side by side. In view of possible difficulties which may arise in securing this freedom while never losing sight of the ideal of the one Catholic Church, the Committee would call attention to Resolutions 24 of 1897 and 22 of 1908. The solution in each case must be left with the Province, but, whatever interim measures be adopted, we are clear that the ideal of the one Church must never be abandoned.

Missionary Societies Still Indispensable.

V. But when all has been said in favour of the transfer of responsibilities to the local Churches, the need of the work of missionary societies remains as urgent as ever. Large areas of

the world are still unevangelized; the British Empire and America are taking ever-increasing responsibilities for the care of the backward races, and this is no time for a relaxation of the missionary effort of the home Churches: in the partially evangelized fields also, we may mention three departments where ever-increasing help from the Missionary Societies is indispensable.

(1) *Evangelistic work*, both in the districts where a large influx of new converts still requires the fostering care of the mission, and in the large outlying districts in which local Churches have not at present the means to undertake the work.

(2) *Institutional work*, such as colleges, schools and hospitals. These are too costly for the local Churches wholly to maintain, and in them the experience and devotion of the foreign missionary are urgently needed.

(3) *Women's work.* The Mission Churches owe more than can be adequately expressed to the devoted service of women missionaries, and it is essential that this help should be continued and extended. Special circumstances in some Oriental lands make an early transfer of women's work to the indigenous Churches impossible, and the organization of the Missions must be maintained. Their work should however be more closely related to the local Church organization, and women can at least by means of Diocesan boards and councils be given their due place in the control of their own work which has its peculiar problems.

Liturgical Variations.

Previous Lambeth Conferences have recognized* the need for the adaptation and enrichment of the services of the "Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church according to the Use of the Church of England" to meet the needs and conditions of races and countries overseas. But with the development of self-consciousness in the indigenous Churches a widespread demand has arisen throughout the Mission Field not only for some adaptation and enrichment of the existing book of Common Prayer, but for forms and services constructed otherwise than those in that Book.

The principle of uniformity expounded in the Preface to the English Prayer Book, (which Preface was not drawn up in the light of conditions such as now exist in the Mission Field,) is neither applicable to Dioceses and Provinces in the Mission Field, nor in itself necessary as a bond of union between Churches which have unity of faith.

* Resolutions viii (1867), 10 (1888), 45 (1897), 24 and 27 (1908).

The essential elements in liturgical forms are few and simple. But over and above these indispensable elements, there is much that is common to the authorized Prayer Books of our Communion which it is desirable and convenient to preserve in any service-books that may be independently constructed, both on grounds of intrinsic and general merit, and as serving to maintain continuity and to promote corporate feeling between the faithful in different parts of our Communion.

We therefore recommend that :—

(i) Rigid liturgical uniformity is not to be regarded as a necessity throughout the Churches of the Anglican Communion in the Mission Field.

(ii) It should be recognized that full liberty belongs to Diocesan Bishops not only for the adaptations and additions alluded to above but also for the adoption of other uses.

(iii) In the exercise of this liberty care should always be taken :—

(*a*) To maintain a Scriptural and Catholic balance of Truth.

(*b*) To give due consideration to the precedents of the early Church.

(*c*) To observe such limitations as may be imposed by higher synodical authority.

(*d*) To remember with brotherly consideration the possible effect their action may have on other Provinces and Branches of the Anglican Communion.

The preparation of forms of service, and especially of an Order for the celebration of the Holy Communion, calls for the highest liturgical skill and knowledge, such as is not always available in every Province, and we believe that the best interests of the Church will be served by the appointment of a permanent Committee of experts in liturgical studies to which, when engaged in such tasks, the various Dioceses and Provinces might turn for advice.

Holy Matrimony.

To avoid confusion we state at once that we regard Christian marriage as the marriage of Christians ; that such a marriage can only be made by the mutual consent before witnesses of both parties to an exclusive, lifelong union ; that it is for local ecclesiastical authorities to state publicly what can be accepted as sufficient evidence of this consent ; that in ordinary circumstances in countries where the State has made laws on this subject (*i.e.*, on what constitutes such evidence), it is desirable that

the Church should accept them when possible; that while the presence or absence of the Church's blessing does not affect the validity of marriage it is the plain duty of all Christians to seek the blessing of the Church on their marriage.

That the marriages of non-Christian persons, though not of necessity exclusive or lifelong, are states of life in which they can and do live without sin, and that where both parties to such a marriage become Christians, the marriage is raised by Baptism to the level of Christian marriage, and must be reckoned as exclusive and lifelong.

With regard to marriages contracted by non-Christians, good in the non-Christian Law, but contrary to Christian Law, we re-affirm the resolution of the Lambeth Conference of 1888:

RESOLUTION 5.—"*That it is the opinion of this Conference that persons living in polygamy be not admitted to baptism, but that they be accepted as candidates and kept under Christian instruction until such time as they shall be in a position to accept the law of Christ.*"

"*That the wives of polygamists may, in the opinion of this Conference, be admitted in some cases to baptism, but that it must be left to the local authorities to decide under what circumstances they may be baptised.*"

We are of opinion that if a polygamist wishes to separate from his wives and be baptized, care must be taken that he make proper arrangements for the separated wives before he can be accepted.

We suggest that where the local authorities decide against the baptism of such persons, they may well be associated in some form of guild provided for them, so as to keep them in touch with Christian life.

A person married as a non-Christian to a person whose relationship to him or her is within the degrees prohibited by the Christian Church, cannot be baptized so long as that partner lives, unless they separate after due arrangement made for the future of the wife.

A marriage, although potentially polygamous, or potentially dissoluble, should be regarded as a good marriage, capable of becoming exclusive and lifelong, in virtue of the baptism of both parties to it, and *ipso facto* becoming so if the baptism takes place. In such cases the parties should not be re-married after baptism, but it is desirable that the fact of the marriage should be publicly acknowledged, and the parties to it should receive the Church's marriage blessing before being admitted to Holy Communion. It is not intended by this to imply that where one party only is baptized, that party should be excluded from Communion until both have been so, but that after the baptism

of the second, they should receive the blessing on their marriage, now fully Christian, and then as Christian man and wife receive Holy Communion together.

A marriage potentially polygamous or potentially dissoluble is not raised to the level of Christian marriage by the baptism of one party. If after such baptism the Christian partner be deserted by the non-Christian, the Christian partner is free under the "privilegium Paulinum" to regard the existing marriage as dissolved and to marry again with any baptized Christian. It should be made clear under this head that the privilege only applies when the Christian partner has been deserted by the non-Christian. If the Christian drive away the non-Christian, he cannot claim it.

Since serious difficulties arise in places where Christian marriages are impossible, from the fact that no Christian partner is available, or from other grave reasons, and that in certain dioceses dispensations have in fact been issued in such cases, we consider that in the present state of the Church, the Bishop of a diocese, after due consultation, and subject to any rule of his Province, should, if he think fit, grant dispensation in such cases. Such dispensation should be strictly limited to an individual case.

If a Christian be united to a non-Christian by non-Christian rites without dispensation, it should be left to the Bishop to decide on the actual validity of the marriage in the eyes of the Church, and the nature of the discipline, if any, to be imposed. We do not say that such a marriage is necessarily invalid in every case.

If such a marriage be declared valid, it is consequently indissoluble on the side of the Christian. (If the non-Christian be eventually baptized, the parties to it should not be re-married, but the marriage should be blessed.) In this case the Christian, who being such had married a non-Christian, has no claim to the "Privilegium Paulinum" which applies solely to cases in which a married heathen becomes a Christian.

The marriage of a Christian with a Catechumen stands on a special footing, and must be treated in each Province in accordance with the status which is recognized in that Province as belonging to the Catechumenate.

Holy Baptism.

Our reference includes "other practical questions" besides marriage. Two such subjects have been referred to us; the first is the question of the baptism of illegitimate children. We prefer to regard this as one application of a wider principle, and to say that it is undesirable that infants should be baptized

unless there is good assurance of their Christian upbringing, but that where this is given, baptism should not ordinarily be refused on other grounds. That what should be accepted and considered such good assurance should be left to the authorities of the local Church.

The second is the case of persons alleged to have been baptized with little or no preparation or instruction. When there is a doubt whether they were baptized at all the case is met by conditional baptism, but when the persons in question are troubled with doubts because of their lack of instruction and faith, we recommend that when the *matter* and *form* of their baptism have been duly verified, the opportunity of confirmation be taken to supply what has been lacking and to allay anxiety. In all cases of difficulty the Bishop would be the right person to decide.

Missions and Governments.

Freedom to preach the Gospel of Christ in every country is a right which must be claimed by Christians of every race and nationality as being essential to their own spiritual life and the fulfilment of their religious obligations. The readiness with which this right will be conceded will depend largely upon the confidence in their "bona fides" which the missionaries can inspire. It must be recognized, on the one hand, that governments have responsibilities which they must fulfil, and on the other, that missionaries, though they cannot divest themselves of nationality, are bound to make it plain that they place their allegiance to Christ above every other allegiance and that they will not jeopardize the extension of His Kingdom by abusing the position which the recognition of the principle of religious freedom has secured for them.

The War had in certain cases sapped the foundations of this confidence, and the imposition of some temporary restrictions on the freedom of missionaries was inevitable. In laying down the conditions on which missionaries of alien nationalities shall be at liberty to exercise their calling within the British Empire, the Government has freely acknowledged the value of the work done by Missions in the past, and cordially welcomed their co-operation in the future, and has invoked the assistance of National Missionary organizations to safeguard the interests which it is bound to protect. We are glad to share in rendering this assistance, believing that in this way we can help to restore confidence, and hasten the time when we may reasonably claim complete freedom for Missionary enterprise.

For a time German Missionaries have been excluded from many fields till confidence can be restored. We do not question the necessity of this, but we feel deeply the loss which the

missionary cause has sustained by their removal from the field of their labours, and the spiritual loss both to them and the world at large which their enforced abstention from much of their missionary work must entail. We recognize it as a duty incumbent upon ourselves and them alike to work for the removal of those causes of mistrust to which this exclusion owes its origin. We cannot fail to recognize the serious influence which this action of the British Government may exercise upon other governments and would emphasize the fact that it is only as a *temporary* measure that we are required to submit to these restrictions: to accept them as *permanent* limitations of religious freedom would come perilously near to the repudiation of our primary Christian obligation.

In dealing with the large number of persons in their colonies and dependencies who profess different faiths, the policy of the British and American Governments has always been that of strict religious neutrality. We heartily endorse this policy, having no desire to see any kind of political influence brought to bear upon people to induce them to change their religion. But we cannot fail to notice that in certain instances the ferment produced among primitive races who have received the Gospel of Christ has led to hindrances being placed in the way of missionaries in the prosecution of their work, and to a preference being shewn for other faiths. The Church would be failing in her work if the acceptance of the truths did not awaken in her converts a higher sense of their dignity as human beings, of their rights as well as their duties, and any government which has the real interest of subject races at heart will be glad of such awakening even though, in civil life, it raises new problems to be solved.

We hold it to be the duty of missionaries to look at their work from the Government point of view, as well as from their own, and to adapt their methods, as far as is consistent with Christian morality and justice and with the Faith and Order of the Church, to the policy which the Government is following in dealing with such peoples. On the other hand, we claim that no discrimination should be shewn against the Christian Faith, and that the greatest care should be taken by public officials, lest they be betrayed into doing or saying anything which is bound to be interpreted by the people in a sense which does dishonour to our Lord. Further, we feel it is necessary to urge that the religious sentiments of Christians are entitled to be treated with the same consideration that is so markedly, and rightly, shewn to those of men professing other faiths.

In the present state of international relations there is a real danger that missionaries may be tempted to forward the commercial and political aims of their own nation, and we emphatically declare that such action lies entirely outside the scope of their proper functions.

The insistent demand on the part of subject races for self-government is one of the outstanding features of the times, and missionaries will sympathize strongly with the desire for self-expression which inspires it. The advisability or otherwise of giving public expression to this feeling will depend upon local conditions, but in no case should a missionary involve himself in the party politics which are inseparable from the pursuit of such an aim. In seeking to secure the removal of some great moral evil, the missionary may feel called upon to support the political party which has espoused this cause, but in doing so should make it clear that it is the moral and not the political issue at stake which has claimed his support. The opium traffic in China is such a moral question, and one which at the present time calls for the earnest attention of the Church. The Committee on International Relations has dealt with this subject, and accordingly we but refer to it by way of illustration.

In Eastern Countries as in the West, the Church has led the way in education, and in some lands still leads; there is a growing tendency, however, throughout the world for the State to claim the training of its future citizens as its own special function, and, being in some cases desirous to impress upon its subjects the stamp of its own peculiar culture, it has been reluctant to allow missionaries of other nationalities to take any part in this work. Christian missionaries, whatever their nationality may be, should recognize the duty of loyalty to the ruling power and its right to claim their co-operation in the development of the spirit of true citizenship. Christianity, as the universal religion, can find outward expression in various types of culture, while inspiring all with the same spirit.

The assumption of the work of education by the State with the national resources at its disposal, must render it difficult for Missions, if largely dependent as they usually are, upon voluntary offerings, to maintain an equal standard of efficiency in an extensive system of schools, but we maintain that the Church has an ideal of education which it is bound to set forth, and the power of developing a type of manhood which no purely secular system can produce, and with which no State can afford to dispense. In the face of this changing situation, the need of shaping afresh the educational policy of missions is imperative, and for the ascertaining of the necessary data on which it may be based and the determination of the policy itself, the co-operation of Christians of all lands is essential. Isolated action is to be earnestly deprecated for the true solution of a local problem is frequently only to be found when it is studied in relation to the whole problem of which it forms a part, and wrong action in one case may have a widespread influence, prejudicial to the general cause of education.

For concerted action some organization, both National and

International, is necessary, which while leaving untouched the independence of Missionary Societies will co-ordinate their thinking and activities. Such organizations can only work effectively so long as they enjoy the complete confidence of the Societies for whose assistance they exist, and herein lies the safeguard against their attempting to assume any coercive jurisdiction. Most valuable service was rendered by the Conference of Missionary Societies of the United Kingdom, and by the Foreign Missions Conference of North America during the War and at the Peace Conference, in safeguarding missionary freedom and saving German mission property from alienation to secular purposes. There is still work to be done in the councils of the nations, which can only be undertaken effectively by some central authority, and the League of Nations should find its counterpart in an International Missionary Conference. Such a Conference, as we have already indicated, would not confine its attention to safeguarding missionary freedom, but would help in shaping missionary policy. "Every solid question," a great thinker has said, "has at least four sides," and there is great gain in enlisting the best missionary minds from different nations for a joint endeavour to solve the problems which face the Church as it seeks to commend the Gospel to every Nation.

In conclusion we desire gratefully to acknowledge the great assistance we have received from :

The Rev. Dr. W. H. Frere, Rev. Dr. Darwell Stone, Rev. Dr. F. E. Brightman, Rev. O. D. Watkins, Rev. Dr. Weitbrecht Stanton, the Rev. Father Puller, the Bishops of Moray and Ross, Vermont, Western New York, N.W. Australia, and Zanzibar, and J. H. Oldham, Esq., who either by personal communication or written statement contributed valuable information, and tendered wise counsel concerning several of the subjects dealt with in our report.

(Signed) F. CALCUTTA,
Chairman.

No. V.

Report of the Committee† Appointed to Consider and Report upon the Position of Women in the Councils and Ministrations of the Church.

We, appointed as your Committee to consider and report on the "position of Women in the Councils and Ministrations of the Church," have drawn up the following Report with a deep sense both of the difficulty and of the importance of the subject entrusted to us. The questions connected with the position of women in the life and in the work of the Church, through the events of the last few years, have had a new emphasis laid on them; and they must be considered afresh in their new context. We are profoundly conscious that the Holy Spirit teaches Christian people by those age-long precedents which we believe to be the outcome of His guidance. But sometimes it becomes our duty, faithfully retaining the lessons of the sacred past, in a very special sense to trust ourselves to His inspiration in that present which is our time of opportunity, in order that He may lead us into whatsoever fresh truth of thought or of action is in accordance with the will of God. For the Holy Spirit is with us and with our generation no whit less than He was with our elder brethren in Christ in the first days of the Gospel.

The foundation of a right and stable view of the whole

† Names of Members of the Committee:—

Bishop of Aberdeen
Bishop of Arizona
Bishop of Ballarat
Bishop of Barbados
Bishop of Chester
Bishop of Columbia
Bishop of Coventry
Bishop of Edinburgh
Bishop of Ely (*Chairman*)
Bishop of Gippsland
Bishop of Grafton
Bishop of Hull (*Secretary*)
Bishop of Jamaica
Bishop of Kingston-on-Thames
Bishop of Leicester
Bishop of Lincoln
Bishop of Liverpool
Bishop of Lucknow
Bishop of New York
Bishop of Ossory
Bishop of Peterborough
Bishop Remington
Bishop of Rhode Island
Bishop of Sheffield
Bishop of Southern Florida
Bishop of Swansea
Archbishop of Sydney
Bishop of Tokyo
Bishop of Toronto
Bishop of Truro
Bishop of Uganda
Bishop of Western Michigan

subject must be laid in a review of the witness of that creative epoch in which first of all our Lord Himself lived on earth and taught, and in which later His Spirit was most conspicuously directing the thought and action of the Christian society. With deep reverence we recognize that the supreme ministry of redemption was wrought out by *One Who was a man*,* (ἀνήρ) Jesus Christ our Lord. It is certain that the Apostles were men; almost as certain that the Seventy were men. On the other hand a woman was chosen to be the handmaid of the Lord in the Incarnation of the Son of God. In our judgement there is nothing to prevent our believing that the Apostolic commission recorded in St. John xx. 19–23 was delivered to women as well as to men. In the parallel history (St. Luke xxiv. 33) we read that the two who came from Emmaus "found the eleven gathered together, and them that were with them." It seems impossible to argue that the last words (τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς) were meant to exclude women. In Acts i. 14 "the women and Mary, the mother of Jesus" are named as having part in the fellowship of the upper room. With Bishop Westcott and Dr. Hort we venture to think that the great commission was given to those who were representatives of the whole Church; and among those representatives we have every reason to think that women had a place. Again, we are led to conclude that the evangelistic charge (St. Matt. xxviii. 16–20) was delivered to a company which included women. The words of the Evangelist are: "But the eleven disciples went away into Galilee, into the mountain where Jesus had appointed them. And when they saw Him they worshipped Him; οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν." The natural meaning of the last words is "but others doubted." Others then, we infer, beside the eleven were present; and if others, then we may say with great probability that women were among them. This probability is immensely increased if we identify, as there is strong reason for identifying, this appearance of the risen Lord with that of which St. Paul tells us (1 Cor. xv. 6), the appearance to above 500 brethren at once. Demonstration in these as in so many other important matters is beyond our reach. But at least the strong probability is that women were among the recipients of the great commission and of the evangelistic charge, as afterwards they were of the gift of Pentecost.

We turn now to St. Paul. Two passages must be briefly considered. (*a*) In Gal. iii. 26–28 the Apostle wrote: "For ye are all sons of God, through faith, in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ. There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female: for ye are all one

* Compare St. Luke xxiv. 19; Acts ii. 22, xvii. 31. What is said in the text above does not exclude the belief that in our Lord's human character there were manifested traits which are commonly feminine.

man in Christ Jesus." The passage quoted begins with the assertion of the potential universality of sonship. It ends with the assertion of the oneness of the body (εἷς ἐστέ). But quite obviously the oneness of the body allows, indeed implies, diversity of function. The passage does not touch the question of the character of woman's functions in the Church. It does not in the least suggest that the functions of women are the same as the functions of men. It simply asserts that membership in the one body is not restricted by race or by social status or by sex. (*b*) It is often said that in his first Epistle to Corinth St. Paul is inconsistent, and various expedients are resorted to in order to reconcile him with himself. Let us look at the passages themselves. In xi. 5 the Apostle writes: "Every woman praying or prophesying with her head unveiled dishonoureth her head." Here St. Paul assumes that there is nothing wrong in a woman praying or prophesying; and prophesying implies the presence of others. He takes it for granted that women will do this. The great Pentecostal prophecy itself foretold that "your daughters" as well as "your sons" "shall prophesy"; and it is added that "upon my handmaidens" will I "in those days pour forth of my Spirit." But in chapter xiv. the context is wholly different. St. Paul is there speaking of the ἐκκλησίαι, the public assemblies of the Church. "Let the women keep silence in the assemblies . . . it is shameful for a woman to speak in the assembly" (compare 1 Tim. ii. 12). In the assembly St. Paul contemplated the whole Christian society in Corinth being gathered together (v. 23); and, what is far more important for our purpose, he expected that persons ignorant of the faith and even that unbelievers—heathen men—would find their way in. Those who were converts from the worship of idols and those who still worshipped idols alike knew only too well the shameful position which women took in the heathen temples and their rites. Corinth was a very bye-word for vice. The Greeks coined a word "to corinthianize," meaning thereby "to play the harlot." The female temple slaves were simply prostitutes. At Corinth then in the Christian assemblies, with their doors thrown open to all comers, St. Paul sternly said that it was "shameful for a woman to speak." Here women must set an example such as no one could question (to use the words of the Pastoral Epistle) of "shamefastness and sobriety." Further, what shall we say of St. Paul's words in this passage about the "subjection" of women? In our belief, as we have already said, St. Paul asserted the spiritual equality of men and women; neither is afore or after the other. This spiritual equality will be realized without let or hindrance in the spiritual world which is to come. But in this present world of action between these equals, man and woman, man has a priority, and in the last resort authority belongs to him. As the world in which we live

becomes more like the world to come, this qualification becomes less and less operative, just as the stronger races assert their power in diminishing degree over their spiritual equals, the weaker races. In times such as that in which St. Paul wrote the necessary qualification became a predominating influence, and in this matter, as in the case of slavery, St. Paul's teaching was conditioned by the existing circumstances of the world around him. He stooped to it that he might raise it. The statement then of what we believe to be the truth in regard to the human relations between men and women, as (we reverently say) in regard to the divine relations between the Persons within the Godhead, must needs take the form of a paradox. Difference of function between man and woman in the Church, as in the world, and the relative subordination of the woman in no way imply an inferiority of woman in regard to man.

Our firm conviction is that the precise form which St. Paul's disciplinary directions took was relative to the time and to the place which he actually had in mind, but that these directions embody an abiding principle. To transfer with slavish literalness the Apostle's injunctions to our own time and to all parts of our own world would be to renounce alike our inalienable responsibility of judgement and the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free. On the other hand it is our duty to endeavour clearly to discern the abiding law which underlay St. Paul's stringent temporary and local rules. We believe it to be this. Human nature being what it is, the Christian Church, whose duty and desire is to keep itself unspotted from the world, and to be like a home of brethren and sisters at unity with each other, must exercise unsleeping vigilance that in its regulations for worship in the congregation there lurk no occasion for evil or even for suspicion of evil; no occasion for confusion or strife; nothing which falls below the purest and strictest ideal of peace and seemliness and order.

It will be observed that in our terms of reference nothing is said about religious communities of women. That great subject therefore with its special problems lies outside our purview. But we cannot refrain from expressing our sense of the notable services they have rendered to the Church and to the world, and our hope and belief that God will be pleased to perfect that which He has begun in them and by them. We may be allowed to add one remark suggested to us by our slight contact with the subject. We believe that much good would result by a closer relationship between a community and the Bishop of the Diocese and by the creation of central advisory bodies, containing an ample representation of the communities themselves, which would promote co-ordination and mutual communication between the several communities.

Before we pass to our proper task of dealing with the position of women in the Church first in relation to its Councils and then in relation to its Ministrations, there are two matters on which we desire to lay stress.

In the first place, the Anglican Communion is spread throughout the world. It has many parts, and these parts are very diverse in character and that in many respects. A Missionary Diocese is utterly different from a diocese which looks back over a continuous history of many centuries. One Church is established; another has no relation to the State which differentiates it from all other religious bodies. The political and social conditions which surround one Church are in marked contrast to those which surround another. Hence we give the advice, which as a Committee we are appointed to give, with the full consciousness not only that, if we may be forgiven for stating a truism, each constituent part of the Anglican Communion is absolutely at liberty to accept or to reject our counsel, but also that, even if it is accepted by all as essentially wise and right, yet all cannot equally and at once translate it into action. It is in this sense that we submit our conclusions to our brethren in the Conference and to the wider circle of all those throughout the world who are joined with us in the fellowship of the Anglican Communion.

Again, when we contemplate the position of women in the Church in the two relations indicated, we are led to believe that there are reasons for change in the custom of the Church, and that on the other hand there are reasons for caution.

When we survey at any rate the recent history of some, if not all, parts of the Anglican Communion, we are obliged to confess that the Church has failed to treat women workers with generosity or even with justice. It is a platitude to say that some of the very best work of the Church has been done, with singular patience and conscientiousness, with singular vigour and ability, with singular devotion to our Lord, by women. But the women to whom we owe this great debt have received but scanty acknowledgement from the Church in the way either of actual salary or of recognition or of a responsible share in directing the activities or the policy of the Church either centrally or parochially.

It is now, we believe, generally, if not universally, recognized that the future must be different from the past. The education of women has advanced in a way which would have seemed incredible to our fathers. Witness the place which women take in the new and even in the ancient universities. Again, in most parts of our Communion the Church is in a new environment of social life which it is impossible for us to neglect. Women sit in legislative and in municipal assemblies. They speak at public meetings on all manner of questions social, economic, political; and that with a grasp of their subject of which the

women of a former generation would have been incapable. We may see dangers in this revolution, but we cannot ignore it or refuse to allow it a practical influence on our judgement. And, further, within the Church we have seen an advance, great, though not commensurate with that in secular matters. Within the last few years many of us have watched the work of the Pilgrims of Prayer and of the Women Messengers. We have noted how these movements have stirred especially country parishes, and have won in a remarkable degree general confidence. They have shewn, past possibility of doubt, that women possess a wonderful evangelistic gift. In their addresses *cor ad cor loquitur*. Women also of mature judgement have spoken at mixed meetings of men and women on the difficult and delicate subject of sexual sin, its prevention and the rescue of its victims, with sympathy, with power, with restraint. These are facts; and we are convinced that, if the recognition of these facts is grudging and inadequate, at least two evil results will ensue. We run a grave risk of wasting a great power for spiritual good, which, as many are profoundly convinced, it is the will of God that we should use for His better service. We also run the grave risk of alienating from the Church, and even from Christianity, not a few of those able and high-minded women before whom, if they turn to social or educational work, there open out careers of great and increasing responsibility.

On the other hand there are reasons for caution. We dare not forget elementary facts of human nature. Women have the power of moving men. By effective speech on religious truths and experiences strong emotions are called into play. On strong emotions possible perils wait. And, especially in a generation which seems sometimes even contemptuously and recklessly to brush aside what a very few years ago were regarded as wise and indeed necessary restraints, the Church must be above suspicion and must not fear to be watchful. Again, there is a deep wisdom in the words of the New Testament which say of a faithful Christian woman "she shall be saved through her child bearing." The Church, while fully acknowledging that some women are called to a life of celibacy, yet in these days of a falling birth-rate and of all that that sinister phenomenon implies, must not do anything which obscures or renders difficult woman's fulfilment of her characteristic function in human life. Again, looking at the whole position from another point of view, we realize how heavy a responsibility rests on the whole of our own Communion, and especially on its rulers, to avoid any action which might retard the growth of mutual recognition and regard between ourselves and other historic branches of the Catholic Church. Lastly, while a real advance as to the position of women is, we believe, not only advisable but even necessary, we feel that the Church owes a duty

to all classes of its members, to those who are (as some may think) slow of movement as well as to those who are (as others may think) ambitious of revolutionary speed.

We now turn to details. And here we wish to record our gratitude for the assistance which we have received from memoranda placed in our hands, from interviews with certain representative women, from the Report (as yet unpublished) of a Committee appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury to consider questions relating to the office of Deaconess, the Chairman of which was the Bishop of Chester, and from *The Ministry of Women* (a Report by a Committee appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and presided over by Bishop Ryle, the Dean of Westminster). We have entirely relied upon this last named book, a work of wide research and learning, for information as to the facts of history.

(1) *The position of women in the Councils of the Church.*—In quite recent times there has been a very considerable advance in regard to the share assigned to women in the Councils of the Church. We may instance in England the "Rules for the Representation of the Laity" (under the "Church of England Assembly (Powers) Act"), which, after enumerating the various Assemblies—Parochial, Ruri-decanal, Diocesan, and the House of Laity in the National Church Assembly—adds the comprehensive direction "All representatives may be of either sex." But the advance made has not been uniform throughout the Anglican Communion. Indeed, considering the great variety of conditions to which we have already alluded, such uniformity is impossible. We have endeavoured carefully to consider the whole question, and we are strongly of opinion that to whatever Assemblies of the Church laymen are admitted, women should be admitted to the same on equal terms. For the sake of clearness we add that in making this recommendation we have in mind provincial or central Assemblies as well as those which are diocesan or parochial.

When this recommendation is acted on we have but one fear. We are conscious that there is a danger lest Churchmen should shirk their responsibilities and leave too heavy a share in the counsels of the Church to Churchwomen, as they have already too often done in the work of the Church. In regard to the conduct of the business of the Church and to the determination of its policy we lay the utmost stress on the ideal of co-operation of Churchmen and Churchwomen; and we believe that the attainment of this ideal, if only there is a conscientious response to the call of plain duty, lies well within the limits of what is possible.

(2) *Deaconesses.*—For the history of Deaconesses in the early centuries of the Church's life and for an account of their functions we must refer to the *Ministry of Women.* It is now about sixty years since, in the Anglican Communion, an effort arose to restore this ancient ministry. But this restoration has been carried out not on the authority of the several churches of our Communion, but rather on that of individual Bishops. The Church in the United States of America is an honourable exception to this statement; for there among the Canons there is a section entitled "Of Deaconesses."

The result of this general informality of action is that a large measure of uncertainty prevails as to the status of a Deaconess and as to the conditions under which she exercises her functions. Is a Deaconess set apart for a religious office? Or is she in the full sense of the word Ordained so that she possesses Holy Orders? Again, can she lay down her office and thereby cease to be a Deaconess? Or does she receive a "character" which is permanent? Again, is a Deaconess at liberty to marry? Or is she by a somewhat indefinite understanding pledged to celibacy? We believe that the fact that it is not possible to give a clear and authoritative answer to these and other like questions has seriously retarded the growth of the diaconate of women among us; for many of the best and ablest women, as we believe, shrink from joining a body the position of which is so ill-defined and precarious. We are persuaded that this period of tentative and provisional action ought now to come to an end, and that the time has arrived when in the interests of the Church at large and, in particular, of the Ministry of Women, the Diaconate (the revival of which ancient office was hailed with thankfulness by the Lambeth Conference of 1897) should be canonically and formally recognized in the several Provinces; and our advice is that, so far as possible, the proper steps should be everywhere taken to secure the restoration of the Order of Deaconesses. We lay stress on the word *restoration:* for what we recommend is not in any sense the creation of a new, but the constitutional restoration of an ancient, Ministry.

We pass to the fundamental question of the status of a Deaconess and of the nature of her ordination. In our judgement the ordination of a Deaconess confers on her Holy Orders. In ordination she receives the "character" of a Deaconess in the Church of God; and, therefore, the status of a woman ordained to the Diaconate has the permanence which belongs to Holy Orders. She dedicates herself to a lifelong service.

But here at once there arises the grave question of the possibility of a Deaconess marrying. We are well aware that opinions on this subject differ, and many who hold the office of Deaconess desire that, though they have taken no vow of celibacy, marriage should be regarded as wholly out of the question for

them. We have given the question our anxious consideration. And we record our deliberate belief that it ought plainly to be understood that no promise of celibacy is required for admission to the Order of Deaconesses. We recognize that a Deaconess who is married is likely to possess as a married woman a peculiar power by prayer and counsel to help married women; and, that being so, we do not think that Deaconesses should be precluded from marrying. A married Deaconess might, especially during the earlier years of her married life, be compelled to ask the Bishop to allow her to suspend the actual exercise of some, if not all, of her functions. But she would retain the status of a Deaconess and, after an interval, would in most cases be able to resume her active work.

We desire to see in use in every branch of the Anglican Communion a Form and Manner of making of Deaconesses, such as might be fitly included in the Ordinal. We assume that all such Forms of Ordination would be of the same general type, and so far as possible similar in their most significant parts, though varying in less important details in accordance with local needs and desires. In all of them there should be included provision for

(1) Prayer by the Bishop with the laying-on of his hands;

(2) A form of words to be said by the Bishop giving authority to execute the office of a Deaconess in the Church of God;

(3) The delivery of the New Testament by the Bishop to each candidate.

Letters of Orders should be given to each Deaconess by the Bishop during or immediately after the ordination, and the names of those who are ordained should be duly entered by the Bishop's Registrar or Secretary in the Diocesan roll in like manner as the names of those who are ordained Priests and Deacons.

We lay great stress on the requirement that each candidate should pass through a course of appropriate training, devotional, practical, and intellectual. Special attention should be paid to the study of the Bible, Christian doctrine, the Book of Common Prayer, and the history of the Church. It will be important to maintain a high standard in intellectual attainments. Each candidate should be examined by persons well qualified for the work and appointed by the Bishop himself.

There is a considerable divergence of opinion as to the right age for admission to the Order of Deaconesses. On the one hand it is pointed out that women who have taken a degree at a University will desire as soon as possible after graduation to enter on the full exercise of the office to which they hope to dedicate their lives. On the other hand it is urged that the office of Deaconess requires a certain maturity in experience and character and is rather a goal of a term of service than of necessity its

beginning. On the whole we think that the determining conditions will vary in the different parts of the Anglican Communion, and that the question of age is a subject best left for independent determination.

We spent much time and careful thought on the definition of the duties of a Deaconess. We are of opinion that the following functions may rightly be entrusted to the Deaconess :—

(1) To prepare candidates for Baptism and Confirmation ;

(2) To assist at the administration of Holy Baptism, and by virtue of her office to be the administrant of that Sacrament in cases of necessity ;

(3) Under such conditions as shall from time to time be laid down by the Bishop, and with the approval of the Parish Priest, (i) to render assistance at the administration of the Holy Communion to sick persons ; (ii) to read Morning and Evening Prayer and the Litany in Church, excepting such portions as are assigned to the Priest only ; (iii) in Church also to lead in prayer and, under licence of the Bishop, to instruct and exhort the Congregation ;

(4) To pray with and to give counsel to such women as desire help in difficulties and perplexities.

Further, we are anxious that the office of Deaconess should be a standing witness that the Church welcomes workers of many kinds, and believes that a pure Christian intention hallows labours which are often regarded as secular. We therefore urge that, while a sufficient training in devotion and in doctrine must ever be considered as an indispensable element in the preparation of a Deaconess, Deaconesses and women looking forward to the Diaconate should be encouraged to qualify themselves for, and to take part in, work for public welfare, *e.g.*, educational, medical, or social. We should rejoice to see a Deaconess devoting much of her time to social or civic activities, provided she undertook those duties as part of her share in the great work of forwarding the Kingdom of God, and performed them in the name of Christ.

The attachment to the office of Deaconess of the functions which we have specified, so sacred, so intimately human, so conspicuously important, so wide in their range, is a sufficient indication that we regard, as we earnestly hope that Church-people generally will increasingly regard, that office as one to be held in reverence and honour.

Circumstances may arise, such as family reasons to which we alluded above, which would cause a Deaconess to desire to resign the exercise of her functions, at least for a time, though by that suspension of her activities she would not forfeit her status as a Deaconess. In such a case she should in our judgement apply to the Bishop of the Diocese in which she has been licensed. Further, we recommend that the Bishop of the Diocese in which

a Deaconess is serving shall have power to suspend her from the exercise of her office and for grave reason to deprive her of her Orders as a Deaconess, the right of appeal in the latter case being duly safeguarded.

We are conscious that many other matters must be determined, if the Order of Deaconesses is to make its full contribution to the life of the Church. But we think that we have dealt with the great principles which are of universal application. Other questions must be determined in the several Dioceses and Provinces of the Anglican Communion.

We desire to call attention to one further matter before we turn from the subject of the restoration of the Order of Deaconesses in the Anglican Communion. The question will certainly be asked whether we have any ulterior object in the proposals which we have made. We have not. We believe that for Women the Order of Deaconesses is the one and only Order of the Ministry which has the stamp of Apostolic approval (Rom. xvi. 1, 1 Tim. iii, 11); and for Women it is the one and only Order which we can recommend that our Branch of the Catholic Church should recognize and use.

(3) *Laywomen.*—In the last place we have endeavoured to give careful consideration to the question of the ministrations of laywomen, that is, of women other than Deaconesses. We desire to lay down the principle that with regard to lay people speaking both in consecrated and in unconsecrated buildings the same opportunities under the same conditions should be given to women as to men. We also think that in Churches as well as elsewhere at services other than the regular and appointed services of the Church laywomen should have the opportunity of leading in prayer.

We realize that in carrying out in practice the recommendation which we have just formulated there will be some necessary variation under the very different conditions prevailing in the several parts of the Anglican Communion. We assume that everywhere women will exercise the ministries which we have above assigned to them with the approval of the Bishop of the Diocese and of the Parish Priest, and under such conditions as shall from time to time be laid down by the Bishop.

We have above equated the opportunities of speaking in consecrated buildings offered to laymen and to laywomen. Among men the habitual exercise of this function is practically confined to those who have been admitted to the office of Readers. An analogy therefore is bound to grow up between the Lay Readers who are men and the women who are entrusted with similar duties. In this context therefore we venture to put on record our opinion that the time has come when the regulations as to Lay Readers (whose devoted work we gratefully acknowledge)

should everywhere be made more definite and precise; and in particular that it is urgently needful that everywhere the standard required of men who are to be admitted to the office of Lay Reader should be raised. We think it our duty to emphasize the importance of carrying out as soon as possible this reform, so essential to the spiritual efficiency of the ministry of lay people.

As we are bidden to make recommendations which shall apply to all parts of the Anglican Communion, we find it impossible effectively to deal with the more general activities of women workers in the Church. Such activities are called out by local needs and are shaped by local circumstances. We cannot let this opportunity pass without expressing our sense of the great blessing such work has brought to multitudes of our people. What however at this moment we feel bound to note is, that women so working are always in danger of becoming isolated and of losing the strength and the larger vision which are the outcome of a wider recognition than that of a Parish. We believe that the security against these possible evils and defects lies in Diocesan organization; and that this security would be provided by a recommendation we put forward which deals with the whole range of women's work in the Church and with which we conclude our Report. We submit that in every Diocese there ought to exist a Board of Women's Work, including among its members men as well as women. This Board would endeavour both to inspire and to direct women workers of all kinds within the Diocese. All approved women workers would be placed upon its roll. It would be ready to give them counsel. It would arrange for Retreats and Quiet days, and take other measures for building up the spiritual life of those who bear a heavy strain of work and difficulty and sometimes of disappointment. It would advise and encourage those younger women who are considering the call to Church work. But among its other functions this Board would always include these two. It would draw up and carry out a scheme whereby certificates of ascertained fitness and competence, recognized at least throughout the Diocese, would be given to women workers qualified in various departments of work. And in the second place it would from time to time consider the questions relating to the training of all women workers in the Church and the conditions of their employment and also to the remuneration of paid women workers in the Church. By such an organization we are persuaded that their position would be raised and rendered more honourable, and that their efficiency, on which so much depends in the coming years, would be made more uniform and more stable.

(Signed) F. H. ELY,
Chairman.

No. VI.

Report of the Committee† Appointed to Consider and Report upon Problems of Marriage and Sexual Morality.

Your Committee appointed to consider "Problems of Marriage and Sexual Morality" begs leave to report as follows:

In approaching the great problems of Marriage, Birth Control, and Sexual Purity we are conscious that we are called upon to deal with subjects of immeasurable importance to the human race, and concerning which nations and individuals look with longing desire for the help and guidance of the Christian Church. We are moved by a sympathy which comes from the knowledge that the temptations to sexual sin are probably the most universal in the world, and by the conviction of our own experience that it is the example and power of our blessed Lord's perfect humanity, with the gift of His Holy Spirit, which enables men to stand firm in hours of trial.

Therefore, in submitting our Report and the accompanying Resolutions, our hope is that our recommendations may be regarded not as the outcome of cold ecclesiasticism, but as the warmhearted effort of experience to guide and to sustain alike those who work for souls, those who long to see nations fit for their

† Names of Members of the Committee:—

Bishop of Bangor
Bishop of Birmingham
Bishop of Derry
Bishop of Dover
Bishop of Duluth*
Bishop of Edmonton
Bishop of Guildford (*Secretary*)
Bishop Howells
Bishop of Huron
Bishop of Kansas
Bishop in Khartoum*
Bishop of Lewes
Bishop of Llandaff
Bishop of London (*Chairman*)
Bishop of Nagpur
Bishop of Nassau
Bishop of North-West Australia
Bishop of Norwich
Bishop of Ottawa
Bishop of Rangoon
Bishop of Riverina*
Bishop of Sacramento
Bishop of St. Edmundsbury and Ipswich
Bishop of Singapore
Bishop of Sodor and Man
Bishop of Southampton
Bishop of Southwell
Bishop of Texas
Bishop of Thetford
Bishop of Vermont
Bishop of Victoria, Hong Kong
Bishop of Western Massachusetts
Bishop of Western Missouri
Bishop of Western Nebraska
Bishop of Willochra
Bishop of Zululand*

great world responsibilities, and those who know that they cannot fulfil God's purpose unless they have learned, whether in married or in single life, to be straight and clean before God and man.

The Christian Church has a code of morals as imperious in its claims as the rule of faith given in the Creeds. The Clergy are commissioned to teach the Christian Religion, which is to guide and hallow men's lives. To bear witness to the Divine Will, and to work for the fulfilment of that Will in the elevation and perfection of human life, is the very purpose of the Church's existence in the world. If the Church is to leaven human society, it must faithfully uphold this standard at any cost, both by its teaching and by the exercise of discipline, refusing the privileges of the Church to those who transgress the divine commandment. This witness is the duty not only of Bishops and Priests, or of the Church collectively in synod or convention, but of individual Christian people. Laws to be enforced, whether ecclesiastical or civil, must have a background of public opinion. Hence the great importance of being rightly informed as to the Christian law in this as in other matters, as well as of faithfulness and courage in bearing witness to it.

All will agree that there can be no subjects of graver importance than those connected with the sacredness of the family. The family is God's first institution upon earth, the cradle alike of Church and State, and marriage is the foundation of the family. Where family life is dishonoured, wedded unfaithfulness lightly regarded, parental responsibility neglected, filial respect and obedience slighted, there, we may be sure, society is rotten at the core. We tremble for the future of a state or nation where lax theories concerning domestic life gain ground. Even laxer practice will certainly prevail.

There is sad evidence at the present time of a widespread lowering of moral conditions.

The increased number of illegitimate births, accompanied by a lowered total birth-rate; the multiplication of divorces, among the consequences of which the breaking up of homes for the children is not the least disastrous; the widespread existence of venereal diseases, acquired or congenital, affecting a large percentage of the population; these all sound a note of serious alarm and warning.

It is easy in this, as in other matters, to throw blame upon the war. To a large extent, and with some aggravations, the war probably disclosed conditions already existing, to which people generally were accustomed to shut their eyes.

We are persuaded that a great deal of the evil in question is due to ignorance, both of natural laws and of Christian teaching on the subject. And for this the Church must take

its full share of blame in having failed to give plain teaching about marriage, and, before this, about purity. Our young people and children must be taught the virtue of purity in the right and reverent treatment of their own bodies and in the relation of the sexes one to the other. Purity should be taught not in a merely negative aspect as a refraining from wrongful indulgence, but as a positive virtue, shewn in the use of our nature, and its every part, for its intended purpose. Whatever there may have been to say in the past in favour of a policy of silence on such subjects, the time for such a policy is now gone. As a matter of fact, knowledge and discussion of matters of sex are far more widely spread than people generally recognize. Children often in early years learn evil in all sorts of ways. Guilty knowledge ought to be anticipated by wholesome training, in which modesty and reserve are carefully guarded. It is a duty and privilege of fathers and mothers to give such instruction to their boys and girls. This parental teaching should be supplemented by guardians, godparents, teachers—ordinarily of their own sex—and clergymen. These must qualify themselves for giving such guidance and instruction, whether individually or in the class or congregation. Each of these methods has its proper place. Educational authorities should be urged to interest themselves in the matter, and to use as may be found possible the influence and capacity of the teachers. In all such instruction care should be taken to train the character of the child as well as to give information in regard to these subjects. The dignity of purity, of a clean upright life, and the possibility of its preservation by the help of God through prayer and the sacraments, must be put before the young.

In connexion with the prescribed preliminaries of marriage, the Committee strongly urges that every effort should be made to impress upon those who are going to be married the importance of the step they are taking and its solemnity. Courtship should be lifted to a higher level, and in particular betrothal should be presented to young people as a sacred matter. We feel that it is incumbent upon the clergy in every possible case to visit the betrothed persons, and to press upon them the responsibilities of marriage, and the sacredness of the union for which they are preparing.

The Clergy are urged, as a part of their regular instruction in the Christian religion, to give to their people plain teaching and explanation about marriage, concerning which many are lamentably ignorant. For instance, they should insist on such fundamental principles as these :

(1) The *law* of marriage. Marriage according to God's design, to which we are recalled by our Lord Jesus Christ, is the

lifelong union of one man with one woman, to the exclusion of all others on either side. It is the union of two persons for the whole and every part of their life which justifies and hallows their physical union.

(2) While the *essence* of marriage consists in the consent before others of the man and woman to live permanently one with another as husband and wife, the Christian Church solemnizes the contract made in the presence of its minister with appropriate prayers and blessing.

(3) The *conditions* of marriage laid down by the civil authority must be complied with before the Church can solemnize a marriage. The Church may impose further conditions for its sanction and benediction.

(4) The *purposes* of marriage. Marriage is intended for the hallowing and control of natural sexual instincts; for the procreation of children, and their nurture and training; and for the mutual companionship and support of husband and wife in good and evil estate. To ignore or defeat any of these purposes is a violation of God's institution.

Clergymen often find their own judgement and experience quite inadequate for answering some of the questions, or for dealing with some of the cases, with which they may be faced in the course of their pastoral work. Much harm may be done by men of the best intentions through lack of knowledge as to the principles upon which their counsel should be based, or the way in which it should be given. The systematic study of Moral Theology ought to be regarded as an indispensable part of training for the Clergy, in order that they may have for their guidance, in the application of Christian principles to particular problems, the formulated experience of those who have given most consideration to the difficulties involved. It is greatly to be hoped that some standard work on this subject may be compiled by Anglican writers which will be accepted as embodying the Church's teaching in the light of present-day needs.

With regard to the permanence of marriage, our Lord's teaching, recalling men to God's original design for marriage, is given by St. Mark. "From the beginning of the creation male and female made He them. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother and shall cleave to his wife; and the two shall become one flesh; so that they are no more two, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together let no man put asunder. . . . Whosoever shall put away his wife and marry another committeth adultery against her: and if she herself shall put away her husband and marry another she committeth adultery." (St. Mark x. 6–12. Cf. St. Luke xvi. 18; 1 Cor. vii,

10, 11.) This has been generally recognized as the principle and standard which the Church of Jesus Christ is bound to maintain. Although there has been from early times a difference of opinion as to the meaning of our Lord's words as recorded in St. Matthew (v. 32 and xix. 9), and as to the lawfulness of remarriage after divorce for the cause of adultery, the Committee would earnestly urge that the only true standard of marriage, which should be steadfastly upheld, is a lifelong union, for better for worse, not shutting out the possibility of penitence and reconciliation even after grievous offences.

Nevertheless, we admit the right of a National Church to deal with the excepted case recorded in St. Matthew under such safeguards and disciplinary provisions as such Church may lay down.

Recognition of a single exception to the rule of indissoluble marriage, "for the cause of adultery," with the disallowance of any other causes that may be considered analogous to this, rests on the fact that sexual unfaithfulness stands in a different position from any other suggested ground of divorce, since it is the perversion of a special and singular relation which has no proper place outside the marriage tie. This is not to make little of the spiritual aspects of marriage of which the physical union is a pledge and expression. Our Lord's words in St. Matthew cannot be taken as giving only one sample out of many sufficient causes for the dissolution of marriage, since none other, however deplorable, touches the root of marriage itself. No compassion for present hardships in particular cases can justify the lowering for all of the standard of Christ, which alone insures the welfare of society and of the race.

Discrepancy between civil law, made by and for persons of all beliefs or of none, and that of the Christian Church, is often the cause of difficulty as to the solemnization by the Church of a marriage, which, though allowed by the State, is not in accordance with the Church's law, and concerning the admission of the parties thus married to the Sacraments and privileges of the Church.

If allowance is not made for such discrepancy, the acceptance of universal civil marriage, followed, where this is sought, by the Church's benediction, might have to be contemplated. For no Christian Minister can suffer himself to be regarded simply as a State official bound to perform or recognize any marriage which the civil law allows. But this would not be, as is sometimes supposed, an easy means of escaping from all complications. The Church's treatment of persons only civilly married would raise innumerable questions of great perplexity. The Church is better able to make its voice heard in this whole matter in some parts of the world than in others, and the acquiescence of the Church in civil marriage in any of the Home countries might react unfavourably in the mission field. In all cases of civil marriage

it is desirable that the ceremony should be performed in a manner befitting the solemnity of the act. The Committee deems it very important that marriage preliminaries, whether ecclesiastical or civil, should be made more satisfactory than they are in many places at the present time. The preliminaries are supposed to insure delay, caution and publicity, but it is more than doubtful whether, generally speaking, they achieve their end.

With regard to the right use of marriage, difficult questions are forced upon our consideration. The purposes for which marriage is ordained have already been stated. It is not for us to deal with the strictly medical discussions on the subject, though these have engaged our careful attention. We recognize that the physical union of husband and wife has a sacramental value by which is expressed and strengthened the love that the one ought to have for the other. At the same time we urge the paramount importance in married life of deliberate and thoughtful self-control and we feel called upon to utter an earnest warning against the use of any unnatural means by which conception is frustrated. We are aware that many persons of undoubted sincerity, whose opinions are entitled to respect, do not share this view, considering the whole matter as chiefly a question of expediency to be determined on medical, financial and social grounds. This contention we cannot admit, as we believe that the question cannot be separated from the moral and religious issues involved.

The appalling statistics concerning the wide spread of venereal disease, reaching in its effect far beyond the person of the offender, forbid us to be silent on the subject. While moved by the most earnest desire to stop the disease, to cure those who have sinned, and in particular to protect the innocent from suffering, the Committee must condemn the distribution, or use before exposure to infection, of so-called prophylactics, since these cannot but be regarded as an invitation to vice. Subsequent treatment of those who have unhappily fallen is an entirely different matter, and should be encouraged and supported.

The Committee would urge that everywhere relentless warfare should be waged on brothels and on all who are directly or indirectly responsible for them ; and likewise feels bound to protest against vice being in any way legalized, regulated or arranged for. In these matters the woman's side is to be considered as well as the man's. Women must not be sacrificed for the supposed benefit of men ; while for men we contend that such provision is neither necessary nor allowable. From the exhaustive research by Mr. Abraham Flexner it is manifest that even the object aimed at, of making vice safe, is not attained by licence and

regulation, since under this system the evil with its consequences of disease is increased rather than diminished.

The wise and firm administration of laws relating to street solicitation, by men or women, should be insisted on. Parks and places of public recreation should be guarded for their proper use and preserved from becoming centres of demoralizing indecency. The employment of women police has in many places been found of great value and deserves the warm support of the Church. In the matter of seduction the age of consent should nowhere be lower than 18 years.

All such repression of wrong, it must be continually remembered, will be of little effect without a heightened public opinion penetrated by religious motives. The fear of God, whose displeasure at sins of impurity is constantly manifested in our experience, as well as recorded in Holy Scripture; personal devotion to our Lord Jesus Christ, the model of true manhood; and trust in the renewing power of the Holy Spirit—are needed to enable men and women to withstand the lusts of the flesh and to present their bodies to God a reasonable, holy and living sacrifice. Along with these higher motives we may plead with men for a chivalrous treatment of all women as of their own mothers, sisters and daughters, and with women for such self-respecting care in matters of dress and behaviour as will claim the respect of men and avoid any putting of stumbling-blocks in their way. All right-minded persons should be urged to unite in the suppression of pernicious literature and of plays, pictures and films suggestive of evil.

Complaints have been made of the low moral tone of Europeans and Americans which sometimes exist with regard to the treatment of Asiatic women and those of other races. There are places where immoral relations with them on the part of foreigners are too commonly regarded as allowable, while with white women they would be severely censured. No such distinction of race or colour can be tolerated by the Christian Church. One law must be maintained of purity and respect for all. At the same time the Committee recognizes the severe temptations to which young men employed in Eastern and tropical countries are exposed, at a distance from their families. We would urge, among other ameliorative measures, the reconsideration, in view of these moral dangers, of unduly severe restrictions sometimes imposed on their marriage.

Sad ignorance and apathy exist among Church people concerning Preventive and Rescue Work. Even in some of our congregations, where missionary interest is keen, the rescue work of the Church is never mentioned. The clergy themselves often-

times manifest a strange ignorance of actual conditions and a lack of sympathy with the efforts being made. What a contrast this to the mind of Christ as expressed in the Gospels! In witnessing for purity, and in restoring those who have fallen victims to sins of impurity, there is an urgent need for enlisting fresh forces. A larger number of educated women endowed with power of discernment and with wide sympathies is called for. In connexion with efficient workers there is need of central Homes for specialized training for this department of work to be carried on, both at home and in the mission field. The aid of a trained woman worker for advice and for organization has been found of the greatest value in a large number of dioceses, and is recommended for wider adoption.

In the care of those who have sinned methods of repression are largely discredited. It is recognized that the beauty and happiness of a Christian life should be put before them, and represented in the cheerful surroundings of the Home and in a living Christian fellowship, along with the discipline which is needed for building the character. For wise treatment greater classification is necessary. Young and old offenders cannot be helpfully gathered together in one Home. The feeble-minded need separate care. Maternity cases must be provided for, with the after-care of mother and child. All this involves a large outlay, but not more than offerings of love and penitence ought without difficulty to provide.

Hitherto the emphasis has been put chiefly on the results of immorality, and that mostly on the women's side. More thought should be given to the building up of pure manhood and womanhood, whereby both God will be glorified and the commonwealth be served.

There has been too general an acquiescence in the degrading lie that chastity is not to be expected in boys and men. The single standard for both sexes, before and after marriage, must be constantly insisted upon. It can be triumphantly pointed to as realized in the lives of multitudes of men and women.

The aid of men of good and disciplined character is needed for the help of boys and young men, and in combating horrible temptations to which they are often exposed from elders of their own sex. The Committee is compelled to notice the prevalence in some quarters of unnatural vice. The strengthening of general sentiment in abhorrence of such practices is of the greatest importance. We fear that the public conscience is not sufficiently alive to this terrible mischief.

Girls and boys are frequently drawn astray through the loneliness and dulness of their lives. As preventive measures, healthy amusements ought to be provided and opportunities afforded for friendly intercourse. We urge that by every kind

of social effort men and women will strive to turn the loneliness of many lives into the brightness which should belong to Christian fellowship.

In the whole matter of combating impurity the co-operation of civic authorities should be sought as well as of medical men.

While preventive and rescue work must be done as a rule on denominational lines, we strongly urge that for the preservation of public morals and raising the standard in a community, all religious denominations, and indeed all men of goodwill, should be invited to unite. Such unity and co-operation increases immensely the force of a moral protest, and by experience it has been found that few moral evils can stand for long before real united action. It is clear, moreover, that a council which represents all right-minded citizens has far more power in prosecuting the publishers and vendors of indecent literature, in clearing parks and open spaces of undesirable characters, and in attacking the at present unchecked scandal of the open sale in some places of contraceptives. It is hoped that some form of Public Morality Council, by whatever name it may be called, may be established in every large city, with local branches to deal with the ever-varying local forms of evil. A Social Service Council in each country or state, such as exists in Canada, would be of great value in bringing the combined pressure of different religious bodies to bear upon legislative and administrative measures affecting moral interests.

It is only by the creation of a healthy public opinion that we can hope to get rid of many temptations which unnecessarily beset the path of our young people, and it is the duty of the Church to lead and foster such healthy public opinion throughout the world.

(Signed) A. F. LONDON:
Chairman.

No. VII.

Report of the Committee† Appointed to Consider and Report upon the Christian Faith in Relation to (*a*) Spiritualism; (*b*) Christian Science; and (*c*) Theosophy.

It has been our task to consider the relation of the Christian Faith and the duty of the Church towards those movements of thought and practice which are associated at the present time with Spiritualism, Christian Science and Theosophy. Many of us have for some time studied much of the literature on one or all of the subjects; the published literature has formed the basis of this report; some of us have also taken opportunities of discussion with those who have special knowledge. It need not be said that our first aim is to be able to understand them at their best, to make sure that we have not overlooked or misrepresented important or salient features. At the same time it is exceedingly difficult to achieve this end. The literature itself is voluminous: and at the same time it is not easy to find authoritative statements to enable us to define precisely the marks which distinguish the teaching and practice to be accepted by adherents. We are told that Theosophy is a body of truths, but that members of the Theosophical Society are not bound to accept any particular statement of them. It is true that Christian Scientists are provided with a book which defines the content of their beliefs: but here again it is difficult to be sure that we appreciate correctly their use of the terms employed; for instance, are we meaning the same thing, or anything like the same thing, when we discuss the terms "reality," "error," "material," "spirit" or "the Christ"?

† Names of Members of the Committee:—

Archbishop of Armagh
Bishop of Asheville
Bishop in Assam
Bishop of Barrow (*Secretary*)
Bishop of Barbados*
Bishop of Derby
Bishop of Exeter
Bishop of George*
Bishop of Glasgow
Bishop of Goulburn
Bishop of Grafton*
Bishop of Grahamstown
Bishop of Jarrow
Bishop of Kensington*
Bishop of Knaresborough
Bishop of Kootenay
Bishop of Lincoln*
Bishop of Llandaff
Bishop of Madras
Bishop Nash (Capetown Coadjutor)
Bishop of Newcastle
Archbishop of Nova Scotia
Bishop of Ossory
Bishop of Ottawa
Bishop of Quincy
Bishop of Oxford (*Chairman*)
Bishop of Sierra Leone
Bishop of Southwark
Bishop of Stafford
Bishop Stearly (Newark Coadjutor)
Bishop of Tuam
Bishop of Victoria, Hong Kong
Bishop of Virginia
Bishop of Wakefield
Bishop of Western New York
Bishop of West Virginia
Bishop of Wyoming

However, we are able to appreciate characteristics common to all three subjects. First, they protest against materialism and a materialistic basis of human life. As in previous periods of human thought, so now this protest is the natural outcome of an epoch of ferment and unrest, and of immense material expansion accompanied by increasing facilities of communication, and by the rapid dissemination of ideas. In the Nineteenth century the development and the range of scientific discovery were stupendous: this tended at first to rivet popular attention upon the application of discoveries to promoting the material facilities and conveniences of life, and at the same time to encourage the belief that all the mysteries of life were discoverable and could be explained by theories derived from and verified by sense-observation. There followed inevitably the recognition of limitation and a sense of dissatisfaction, and it would be true to say that all departments of human speculation have been turned more and more in the direction of relating man and the world in which he lives to God, of recognizing the reality of the unseen, and of a deep longing for some revelation of it. Upon all this has come the catastrophe and shock of the War and the desolating, bewildering questions which such an experience raises. It is easy to understand the appeal which in times like our own the Spiritualist, the Christian Scientist and the Theosophist make, especially to those who may have been indifferent to the spiritual claim of religion and religious motives or absorbed in material interests.

Secondly, all three movements draw much of their strength from a new knowledge of the extent of psychic powers with which human nature is endowed. It seems that these powers are as real as, though less general than, our physical powers, and further, that the use or abuse of them depends in the same way upon spiritual control and direction. This is plainly shewn by the use and abuse of psychic gifts in the Bible story. Indiscriminate exercise of them is often just as fatal to the individual and to society as uncontrolled use of physical powers. Until it becomes clearer how such psychic powers may be rightly used and controlled, the Church is supported by psychologists in advising the greatest caution and restraint.

Thirdly, each of the three movements claims to supply something which the teaching and practice of the Church fail to give, whether in directness and correspondence with human needs of to-day or in comprehensiveness. Here they make their appeal to professed members of the Church who, for whatever reason, are left unsatisfied by the normal teaching and discipline offered to them.

Fourthly, there is nothing essentially new in these particular movements, either in the circumstances which have stimulated them, or in the ideas which they express, or in the teaching which

is given. It is not difficult, for instance, to recognize a revival of the doctrines, sometimes couched in the same terms, of the Gnostics and the Neo-Platonists, with the same developments of spiritualistic practice and the same distortions of it by the ignorant or the unscrupulous.

Fifthly, none of these movements finds its centre in the central revelation of the Christian Faith, namely the Incarnation of our Lord as the unique fact of human history and the means as well as the manifestation of redemption. Spiritualism practised as a religious cult appears generally to be independent of it: Christian Science seems to allegorize it or to allow it to fade into a false mysticism: Theosophy loses sight of it in a fusion of various religious systems.

We are therefore challenged now as in previous ages to fulfil as guardians of the Faith our natural office. We do not mean that we have merely to repeat time-honoured formulae. We have to state, and to state in terms which are real and convincing to the mind of our time, the fundamental truths of the Christian revelation, and following from them the purpose of our life here, its discipline, its hope, and its bearing upon a life beyond. Let it be said that one condition on which these truths become convincing is that the statement of them should be enriched by all the knowledge available. As has been said of Origen, so it must always be said of guardians of the Faith, "his faith was catholic and therefore he welcomed every kind of knowledge as tributary to its fulness." We are able wholeheartedly and without shrinking to welcome research, criticism, scientific investigation: we are ready to accept conclusions to the extent and within the limits which scientific reasoning and methods authorize. We have to safeguard ourselves and others against the inevitable tendency to allow the imagination to be caught by theories, and to translate them into practice, before we are sure of the grounds upon which they rest. Above all it is only by keeping firm hold of the cardinal truths upon which Christian faith and practice are established that new knowledge can be given its right setting.

The Christian Faith in relation to

(*a*)—spiritualism.

It seems that in dealing with this subject on behalf of the Conference we have to address ourselves to two distinct questions: (1) What have we to say to the investigations of the phenomena of human consciousness and the results of those investigations conducted for a period of years, beginning in 1876, when Sir W. Barrett brought the subject of thought-transference or telepathy before the British Association, and carried on notably by the Society of Psychical Research? (2) What have we to say to

the religious cults and practices which have been created on the basis of what is believed to have been so far discovered and is known as Spiritualism ?

In answering the first question we say without hesitation that we welcome scientific investigation : we recognize the patience and the skill with which members of the Psychical Research Society examine the mass of evidence of all kinds submitted to them, and above all the unmistakeable desire to safeguard the inquiry against illusion or fraud, to arrive at truths, and to interpret scientific facts correctly. It is not for us to decide whether the scientific methods applied to these particular phenomena are appropriate, *i.e.* whether the methods of physical science can be applied to psychical phenomena. Our desire is to understand what conclusions have been reached along these lines of research. These have been stated as follows :

(1) There is a conviction of the reality of telepathy, or communication between living beings by means which appear to be independent of the normal sense-organs.

(2) There is also a conviction of the reality of a subconsciousness which may operate without the control of the normal consciousness and will (*e.g.* in dreams).

(3) This does not necessarily imply communication with beings no longer limited by the conditions of bodily existence as we know it here ; but there are phenomena which appear to support that hypothesis.

(4) In investigating such phenomena great difficulties arise owing to the play, very imperfectly understood, of the subconscious self in the medium employed and in the inquirer. Mrs. Henry Sidgwick writes : " Before we can convince the world we not only want more cases giving evidence of the fact of personal survival but we want them solidly based on more knowledge of the subliminal self and the way it works, more knowledge of the conditions and process of telepathy, more understanding of the limitations under which communication with the dead occurs."

The outcome of these conclusions from the scientific side would seem to be :—

(1) To give a serious warning against unregulated and undue exercise of an element of human consciousness which acts independently of the reason and the will, and against allowing reason and will to abdicate in its favour.

(2) To insist upon an outlook upon life which refuses to accept materialism as a sufficient account of phenomena, and to encourage belief in a spiritual explanation.

We welcome inquiry conducted in this reverent and scrupulous spirit.

In answering the second question we enter on our main and proper function, which is to consider the religious cult and practice of what is called Spiritualism. We have evidence that, especially under the stress of the horrors and anxieties of the war, particularly in our crowded areas, Spiritualism has affected in some instances even regular Church-goers, withdrawing them from the Church. But it has mainly laid hold of that large class amongst us who have been casual in religious observance, and have never grasped or made their own the Christian teaching which rests upon the revelation gradually unfolded in the Bible, summed up in the Creed, and realized for us here in Sacraments. It deals with man's fellowship with God, and therefore with immortality, eternal life and the life we share with those who have passed from us. Many have felt and expressed dissatisfaction with the consolations offered by the Church, have misrepresented—no doubt unconsciously—what the Church holds and teaches, and have imagined that Spiritualist doctrine supplies something which the Church lacks and which the spirit of man needs to strengthen and uplift it. This shews that we have failed to teach clearly enough or fully enough the great simple Christian truths about the supernatural, and the grounds upon which those truths are based. We think there is real need now and in the immediate future to use the opportunities provided abundantly by the Press as well as in other ways to make clear and definite statements of what Christianity holds and hands on about the life of the world beyond and our relation to it during our life here.

Any such statement will insist that our view of life essentially centres in God ; that the purpose of man's life here, or hereafter, is to attain fuller knowledge of God, a deeper, richer love of God, and a closer union with His Being ; that Jesus Christ is not only Himself Eternal God but also the one Mediator, through His Incarnation and Redemption, by whom man can reach God : that by His life in us, and by our life in Him we become sons of God : that the Sacraments convey to us the grace of God : that revelation through the prophets is the unfolding to us of the Wisdom of God : that the Eucharist is the method by which, through union with Jesus Christ, we may arise to God. Our duty and relation to one another rests upon the dependence of all of us upon God. The whole faith, strength, hope, activity of a Christian centres in the Love of God which is in Christ Jesus shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit to comfort and support us ; and God's Love holds together in constant fellowship those who share that Love here and those who have passed beyond.

Spiritualistic religion and practice throw a wholly different emphasis upon the motive power of man's life : immortality is there concerned with the survival of human persons more than with God ; the life beyond is represented largely as an extension

of what is experienced here and now ; and the fact is overlooked that survival is not necessarily immortality, still less eternal life.

But, further, the Christian Faith declares that the life in Christ after death is an advance towards a more perfect fellowship with God for those who have been seekers after God and have not alienated themselves from fellowship with Him. That fellowship we may enjoy imperfectly here through the eternal life on which we have entered and in virtue of which by the grace of God we are enabled to respond to Him. We insist that conduct and the working out of character in the ordeal of life here is of vital importance in determining the condition under which we may enjoy fellowship with God hereafter.

In its doctrine of the Communion of Saints the Church insists that we can and do have Communion with the departed through the Love of God which is in Christ Jesus. The mediation of Christ is the only medium which we recognize as the means by which we approach God : and it follows that all who strive and use the means to live in Christ are united to one another in Him—" neither death, nor life " can separate them. We are content to leave in His hands all who have passed from our life here, knowing that our communion with them through Him is intensely real.

This may be fully accepted by Spiritualistic teachers and yet they might urge that such communion does not conflict with definite communication : indeed might not definite communication serve to make the fact of the spiritual world and our fellowship with it more real ? To this we should answer that the constant search for definite communication as practised by spiritualistic teachers does, in fact, arrest the development of faith, diverting us from the need and also from the means of our spiritual education to an interest in experiments to determine whether communication is possible or real and to the desire to escape from the discipline of faith. The " eye of holiness " and nothing less than holiness is required for the vision of the unseen world ; the pure in heart see God the more completely as they grow in purity. Moreover, many practices by which such communication is sought lead to a loss of true communion through the Love of God in Christ Jesus, because in them the subconscious self is released from the control of our wills, and no moral struggle for purity is made. Our whole personality is not raised to the realm of spiritual being, but one element is allowed to become dominant, and that element manifestly the least regulated and regulative of our faculties, and, therefore, the most exposed to illusion and deception. The Christian Scriptures undoubtedly declare the existence of unseen beings who influence men for good or evil. We cannot, therefore, dismiss the possibility of communications from such beings of either nature. Such possibility will for Christians form an additional reason

for precaution when they are invited to seek intercourse with the spirits of the departed. We cannot insist too strongly upon the known fact that the indiscriminate and undisciplined indulgence of subconscious activity may gravely injure character, and that the habit of recourse to *séances* and "seers" leads to no spiritual benefit.

It is possible that we may be on the threshold of a new Science, which will by another method of approach confirm us in the assurance of a world behind and beyond the world we see, and of something within us by which we are in contact with it. We could never presume to set a limit to means which God may use to bring man to the realization of spiritual life. But there is nothing in the cult erected on this Science which enhances, there is, indeed, much which obscures, the meaning of that other world and our relation to it as unfolded in the Gospel of Christ and the teaching of the Church, and which depreciates the means given to us of attaining and abiding in fellowship with that world.

(*b*)—CHRISTIAN SCIENCE.

We desire to acknowledge the debt we owe to the Lambeth Conference of 1908 for the Report on Ministries of Healing, and to record our general agreement with that Report.

Twelve years have passed since that Report was issued. These have been years of active research and the war has provided manifold experience in all branches of healing. It is therefore natural that some advance should now be made towards definite conclusions upon questions that were left open by the last Conference and that certain fundamental truths should be re-emphasized in their bearing upon present problems.

It appears to the Committee that too much emphasis has been laid in many quarters upon the distinction between what are called spiritual means of healing, and what are called physical means of healing. Wherever this distinction is wrongly made it is fatal to truth. The promise of Christ to His Church is that His Spirit shall guide His people into all the truth. In view of that promise we are justified in claiming as due to the operation of the Divine Spirit all progress in the knowledge of the physical world, particularly such knowledge as is being constantly brought into the service of love through the relief of human suffering. Thus we claim as due to the Spirit of the Incarnate Christ all the devoted and self-sacrificing labour in scientific research and in the application of the results of that research in medicine, surgery, nursing, hygiene and sanitation. Full account must also be taken of the great progress which has been made since the last report was issued in psychotherapeutics or psychiatry in all its branches. Side by side with these we recognize that both in study and in practice there

has been notable development in the direction of healing with prayer accompanied by laying-on of hands or of anointing.

In these three departments of healing considered under the heads of physical science, psychology, and religion, without making a claim to exact analysis, we seem to find some correspondence with the threefold division of Man's nature into body, mind, and spirit, and we look forward confidently to an orderly movement towards the adjustment and co-ordination of these three aspects of the work of healing.

In an age of specialized study we have constantly to be upon our guard against over emphasizing one aspect of the subject-matter. To ignore or exaggerate one aspect of healing must result in failure to achieve the full purpose of God's gifts. We believe that no one of these aspects of healing can possibly be excluded from the scope of the term spiritual. Physical means of healing can only be regarded as unspiritual when men deliberately shut their eyes to the truth that these means are the creation and gift of God. It is the task of the Church to remind and persuade all concerned in this ministry of healing, patients no less than physicians, nurses, and others, of the spiritual nature of their undertaking and to affirm our faith that in the lively sense of this lies the best hope of success.

And here we are bound with penitence to acknowledge that there has often been a grave deficiency in our Church's faith and teaching. Not sufficiently have we emphasized our Lord's revelation of the Fatherhood of God, of the fulness of His Love, of His loving care of body as well as of soul, which invites us to cast all our care upon Him.

The Gospel lesson of " God-Faith " and the inward joy and peace, of which the best Christian experience is the witness, have been allowed too often to lose their supremacy. Christians safeguard that supremacy not by ignoring or denying the fact of suffering, but by transfiguring it through the teaching, example and power of our Lord.

This neglect on our part to enforce certain aspects of the Christian faith has led inevitably to reaction. The Movement known as Christian Science for instance has undoubtedly helped to call attention to the importance of spiritual forces in the work of healing and in the promotion of happiness and general well-being. This movement has, however, tended, often with grave results both to children and to adults, to disparage all physical methods of healing and God's gift of scientific research and knowledge which is intended to be received and used with thanksgiving.

Under the influence of this pseudo-spirituality Christian Science has developed doctrines which, so far as we can gather from its text-book, appear to be in direct conflict with the Christian faith. We need only dwell upon one or two of these points.

(1) Christian Science emphasizes the Oneness of God and of the Universe in a way that does not in fact escape from pantheism. Oneness is regarded as undifferentiated Oneness in which no real place is left for distinctions or for variety. Personal terms are used of God but are at the same time declared to be synonymous with impersonal Principle. As against this we would urge the fulness of the teaching of the Catholic Faith concerning the Personal Being of God as revealed in the doctrines of the Incarnation and of the Blessed Trinity.

(2) Christian Science in fact revives the old dualism of matter and Spirit: matter is wholly illusory, the source of nothing but error and therefore evil. As against this the Catholic Faith teaches that while Spirit is supreme, matter is a vehicle through which Spirit finds expression: the whole world is sacramental: we touch here a conviction that is fundamental to the Christian faith. If matter, as Christian Science maintains, is non-existent and cannot enter into the consciousness of God, the Incarnation of the Son of God in human nature is impossible, and Scriptural teaching upon the redemption of man and of creation becomes meaningless.

(3) In the presentation of our Lord a distinction is made between Christ the ideal Truth and Jesus the human prophet of Galilee. Jesus becomes the man who more than any other man proved the Principle which heals the sick and casts out error to be divine. There is no essential distinction between our Saviour and all other men—though a difference in the degree of possession of the Christ Ideal is fully emphasized. There is no conception at all of grace coming to men through Jesus Christ; we are only invited to follow in His steps as of one who is the Wayshower.

(4) The denial of the reality of sin empties the Atonement of its usual Christian content.

In the light of what has been said we would urge the following practical recommendations:—

There should be—

(1) Clearer and more constant teaching as well as study of the full doctrine of the Church in its bearing upon true spirituality.

(2) Teaching about Prayer and Holy Communion; special efficacy is promised to the "prayer of faith"; this prayer may be offered by individuals, by congregations in Church, and by prayer-circles formed of those who desire to forward the work of healing. In Holy Communion also the thought of our Saviour's care of the body has its place; in the words of administration the preservation of the body is mentioned side by side with the preservation of the soul.

(3) We would urge the recognition of the Ministry and gifts of healing in the Church, and that these should be exercised under due licence and authority.

This, in our opinion, will involve :—

(*a*) Instruction both of clergy and laity so that the corporate faith of the Church may be stimulated and the power to heal may be released.

(*b*) Training : we feel that it is important that Candidates for Holy Orders should be equipped by training in psychology, and be given some acquaintance with methods and principles of healing. Only so will the clergy be enabled rightly to direct the thought of their people on the subject and to discriminate between truth and error.

(*c*) Revision of the Office of the Visitation of the Sick ; or the provision, under due authority from National or Provincial Churches, of an alternative office containing recommendations and regulations for laying-on of hands with prayer for recovery with or without unction as may be desired.

(*d*) Authorization : all who are licensed under due authority for this work should be persons who are loyal to the Church's Faith and Sacraments, who are willing to work in full co-operation with the Medical profession, and who are willing to work also in loyal co-operation with the parochial clergy.

In conclusion, while unable to dwell upon the many problems which the whole subject raises, relating to the mystery of pain and suffering, we may say that while disease is a part of the lack of harmony with the perfect will of God, and thus that all healing powers are an expression of God's will and power to heal, yet pain and suffering in themselves also bear witness to the working of God's laws in nature in this present order. The ordeal of life here is the education of the human spirit in full obedience to God and trust in Him ; suffering, therefore, may be overruled by God for blessing, and is, within our experience, constantly so overruled, becoming thus a means of true spiritual growth and of intimate fellowship with our Saviour. " Who learned obedience by the things which He suffered ; and being made perfect, became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey Him."

(*c*)—THEOSOPHY.

The Theosophical Society represents a vigorous revival of earlier mystical and occult philosophies. The rediscovery of the teaching of Asiatic religions, the realization of latent psychical powers in human nature, the revolt against exclusivism and traditionalism in some current forms of Christian theology, the recognition of the continuity and unity of human evolution, all these factors combined to create a demand for a more complete

synthesis of all human knowledge and belief. Modern Theosophy offers to supply this demand. It is however extremely difficult to determine what Theosophy is. Representative English theosophists insist that the Theosophical Society stands only for its three stated objects, *viz.* (1) "to form a nucleus of the Universal Brotherhood of Humanity without distinction of race, creed, sex, caste or colour," (2) "to encourage the study of comparative religion, philosophy and science," (3) "to investigate the unexplained laws of nature and the powers latent in man." The Society disclaims any authoritative or obligatory body of teaching or any official identification with the views propounded by its leaders. It consists of "students belonging to any religion in the world or to none," and "their bond of union is not the profession of a common belief but a common search and aspiration for Truth." Your Committee, while accepting these statements, cannot but regard the Theosophical Society as incurring a certain measure of responsibility by the publication and circulation of theosophical literature. In a booklet entitled "Theosophy and the Mission of the Theosophical Society," published by the Society and lately sent to members of the Lambeth Conference, it is stated that "Theosophy is the body of truths which forms the basis of all religions and which cannot be claimed as the exclusive possession of any." "The immanence of God, the solidarity of man, such are the basic truths of Theosophy." "Its secondary teachings are those which are the common teachings of all religions, living or dead." Among these are reincarnation, karma, and "the existence of divine Teachers, superhuman Men, often called the White Brotherhood." And "it is the mission of the Theosophical Society as a whole to spread these truths in every land." Your committee desire to point out that the literature of the Society contains a large amount of common positive teaching embodying a definite and distinctive view of the universe, which we are therefore justified in regarding and describing in this report under the title of Theosophy.

The Committee recognize frankly that there is nothing in the Christian faith which precludes sympathy with the pursuit of the three stated objects of the Theosophical Society. The methods and alleged results of theosophical study are quite another question. Theosophical leaders and teachers claim to impart knowledge derived from occult sources. They claim to be in communication with a brotherhood of pioneers of the human race who have reached the goal of their own evolution and now control and guide the evolution of their race by operations in the unseen world or by reincarnation on earth. They claim also that they have themselves by a process of mystical self-discipline developed latent powers of consciousness which enable them to read occult traces left in the etheric records of

the universe by past events and experiences. We regret that the occult methods of theosophists are not made available for scientific investigation, especially in view of the fact that their theory of different organs and planes of human consciousness, for example, is stated to be "a matter not of speculation but of observation and experiment." The Christian Church has nothing to fear from established conclusions of sound psychical research, for the Christian faith is not identified with or dependent on any particular theory of the constituents of human consciousness. But we cannot resist the impression that the methods of theosophical occultism are not free from psychical conditions of a morbid and demoralizing tendency. The secrecy of an esoteric section pledged not to reveal its methods and experience is in any case not a healthy atmosphere for the search after divine truth.

The theosophical conception of God is too elusive for precise analysis. In the West it appears to be a nebulous theism, but significantly enough in India it assumes somewhat of a pantheistic or even polytheistic form. Everywhere it tends to exaggerate the affinity between human and divine spirit into identity, and its real inwardness is evident in the theosophical presentation of Christ. It is in the twin doctrines of reincarnation and karma that Theosophy begins to come into more or less direct conflict with the Christian faith. The doctrine of reincarnation appears to us both philosophically and scientifically unsound. But our concern is rather to insist that this doctrine, which theosophists preach as a lost element of true Christianity, can only be found in the New Testament by an arbitrary and artificial exegesis; that in its theoretical explanation it leaves apparently no place for conscious continuity of personality or of personal relationships; that in its practical working it tends to destroy both perseverance and sympathy. The doctrine of karma or the law of consequence, namely, that the quantitative karma or result of a man's conduct must be worked off gradually in this or some future existence, evacuates forgiveness of all spiritual reality. A doctrine which drives its exponents to describe Christ's absolution of the penitent as a mere announcement that his karma was exhausted is the very negation of any conception of divine forgiveness.

The conflict between Theosophy and the Christian faith becomes irreconcilable when we reach the central fact of Christianity, the Person of Christ. Theosophy teaches that "the Jesus Christ of the Churches" is a fusion of three distinct elements—historical, mythical and mystical. "The historical Christ is a glorious being belonging to the great spiritual hierarchy that guides the spiritual evolution of humanity, who used for three years the human body of the disciple Jesus." This Jesus was a Jew born 105 B.C. and trained in the occult lore of the

East in Egyptian and Essene brotherhoods until the time came for him to lend his body for the incarnation of a supreme Teacher. Afterwards, while the Christ " visited His disciples for something over fifty years in His subtle spiritual body . . . training them in a knowledge of occult truths," the man Jesus " perfected his human evolution " and " became the Lord and Master of the Church founded by the Christ." At the present time Jesus, " clothed in a body he has taken from Syria, is waiting the time for his reappearance in the open life of men." Meanwhile he " lives mostly in the mountains of Lebanon." Instead of the one Jesus Christ, God and man, we are here given two persons : a Christ who is divine but not God, and a Jesus promoted from humanity to quasi-divinity.

" The mythical Christ " means that the cardinal facts embodied in Christian creeds and holy days were not historical facts but myths attached to " the Christ of the Church " as they had been attached to similar beings in earlier religions. " The mystical Christ " is the truth symbolized by the myth. The Christ-myth represents the descent of the divine Word into matter in creation, and the birth and ascent of the human Christ. This indwelling Christ is the higher self of man, a self-evolution of the higher nature of man, typified by the gospel allegory but independent of any historical Christ. It is sufficient here to point out that this triple Christ of theosophical research, presented to us on the authority of " the occult records " is not the Christ of the New Testament. It is a flagrant contradiction of the Gospels. It is a subtler but no less radical contradiction of the Christian mysticism of St. Paul, for whom the Christ-life in man is always dependent upon the reality both of the redemption wrought by the Incarnation and of the present activity of the ascended Christ.

The uniqueness of the Person of Christ involves the universality of His mission and message. Theosophy in denying the uniqueness of the Person of Christ denies the universality of the Christian religion. It teaches that beneath the exoteric form of all religions there lay and still lies the same esoteric body of essential truths—that the Christianity of the Churches is only the exoteric form of the Christian religion—and that the mission of Theosophy is to reveal and restore the lost esoteric truths of this and every religion. Theosophy therefore consistently discounts and discourages the missionary claim of Christianity, for it denies that Christianity has anything essential to give which is not already contained in the esoteric truths of other religions. Theosophy here represents the extreme recoil of modern thought from the older view which saw little or no truth in non-Christian religions. That view is foreign to the Christian faith and has long ceased to dominate Christian missionary thought. The Christian Church stands for the belief

that truth and life in religion everwhere come through the Word working in the world, and that what all races and peoples need now is the fuller life and truth which can only come from conscious knowledge of the Word made flesh, the historical Christ who was and is the Son of God.

The Committee, while acknowledging that there is nothing in the avowed objects of the Theosophical Society which is in itself incompatible with loyal membership of the Church, desire to impress urgently upon the members of the Church the necessity of the greatest caution in pursuing the study of Theosophy. Theosophists use the language of Christian adoration but in senses which are not those of the Christian faith ; and their language is so Christian in sound that their disciples fail to realize how far they are being carried away from the Christian position. We urge Christian people therefore to examine very carefully every stage of the teaching offered them in the name of Theosophy. The need of such examination is already evident in the case of theosophical teaching with regard to Jesus Christ. It is seen vividly too in the case of the Order of the Star in the East, an Order founded in India in 1911 " to draw together those who whether inside or outside the Theosophical Society believe in the near coming of a great Spiritual Teacher for the helping of the world." The stated principles of the Order contain much that is in harmony with Christian self-discipline. But we feel bound to warn Church people against allowing themselves to be drawn unthinkingly into the Order by their expectation of the coming of Christ. The current expositions of the work of the coming Teacher appear to us to ignore the teaching mission of the Holy Spirit, and in other ways also to misinterpret the New Testament, which represents the future Advent of Christ not as a second ministry of sowing but as a harvest of results—not as a new gospel but as a judgement. But there is a far graver danger in the fact that the Order in India, its birth-place and headquarters, is associated with positive teaching to the effect that the coming Christ is identical with the Lord Maitreya of Buddhist mythology, and is to be incarnate in the body of a Tamil youth now living, named Krishnamurti. We urge Church people attracted by the apparently or potentially Christian character and outlook of the Order to consider seriously whether they can reconcile this teaching with their own faith in Christ.

Secondly, we urge Christian people to remember that in view of the fact that most students of Theosophy are necessarily dependent upon the teaching and guidance of a few members of the esoteric section, it is of vital importance to examine the character and credentials of the exponents of Theosophy upon whose authority they are encouraged almost blindly to rely. We urge them to bear constantly in mind St. John's warning

to Christians beset by an earlier stage of Theosophy—"Believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God."

The Committee desire to close their report with a positive note of recommendation. The attraction of Theosophy for many thoughtful Christian minds lies largely in its presentation of Christian faith and life as a quest. Christian faith is indeed a quest for truth yet to be revealed no less than a grasp of truth already revealed. The pastoral care of the Church for the common needs of all souls requires simple and definite doctrinal statement, such as the Church has always provided. At the same time we must admit that different schools of thought within the Church are alike in danger of falling into a stereotyped line of teaching, into a narrow dogmatism and traditionalism forgetful of the needs of such souls as are deeply conscious of the mystery into which all known truths shade off and of the fascinating and perplexing questions on which Bible and Creed alike leave speculation free. Responsible teachers of the Church therefore—and the clergy are called to be teachers no less than preachers—will do well to remember both of the lines on which the great early Christian teachers met and answered gnostic theosophy of their day. Like Tertullian and Irenaeus we must insist on the plain meaning of Scripture and the unity and continuity of traditional Christian belief. But also like Clement and Origen we may claim all life and learning as food for Christian thought, developing what might be called a true Christian theosophy, embracing the spiritual experiences of poets, saints and mystics, and reverently speculating beyond the borders of revelation, so long as we hold fast to the historic facts of the Creed and to the sacramental communion of the Church.

The Committee, while pleading for a larger place to be given in the teaching of the Church to the mystical elements of faith and life, desire earnestly to advise all thinking people to safeguard their Christian position by making the fullest study and use of the treasures of knowledge and thought to be found in Bible, Creed and Sacrament as they have been interpreted by sound Christian scholarship and philosophy. The Committee in this connexion welcome the forward movement of the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge in the way of providing Christian literature of the first rank, and commend the efforts made by various agencies and associations within the Church for the higher religious education of the faithful laity.

(Signed) HUBERT M. OXON:
Chairman.

No. VIII.

Report of the Committee † Appointed to Consider Relation to and Reunion with Other Churches—(*a*) Episcopal Churches; (*b*) Non-Episcopal Churches, with Questions as to (i) Recognition of Ministers; (ii) "Validity" of Sacraments; (iii) Suggested Transitional Steps.

The Committee appointed to consider and report upon relation to and reunion with other Churches divided itself into two sub-committees dealing with the two main divisions of the subject submitted for their consideration, namely (*a*) Episcopal Churches, and (*b*) Non-Episcopal Churches. Of these two sub-committees, the former was presided over by the Bishop of Gloucester, and the second by the chairman of the whole Committee.

The whole Committee is responsible for the first part of the Report, including the Appeal, and Resolutions which follow this part. Each Sub-Committee is responsible for its own Report and for the Resolutions founded upon it.

† Names of Members of the Committee:—

Bishop of Aberdeen
Archbishop of Algoma
Bishop of Argyll (*a*)
Archbishop of Armagh
Bishop of Atlanta
Bishop of Bath and Wells*
Bishop Hamilton Baynes
Bishop of Bethlehem
Bishop of Bombay (*Secretary*)
Bishop of Brechin (Primus)
Archbishop of Brisbane
Bishop of Bristol (*Secretary*)
Bishop of Chelmsford
Bishop of Chichester
Bishop of Columbia
Bishop of Derby
Bishop of Derry
Bishop of Dornakal
Bishop of Down
Bishop Du Moulin (Ohio Coadjutor)
Bishop of Durham
Bishop of Ely
Bishop of Gibraltar (*a*)
Bishop of Gloucester (*a*)
Bishop of Hankow
Bishop of Harrisburg (*a*)
Bishop in Jerusalem (*a*) (*Secretary*)
Bishop Johnson (Missouri Coadjutor)
Bishop Joscelyne
Bishop in Khartoum (*a*)
Bishop King (*a*)
Bishop of Kootenay
Bishop of Kyushu
Bishop of Madras
Bishop of Manchester
Bishop of Massachusetts
Bishop of Meath
Archbishop of Melbourne
Bishop of Mombasa
Bishop of Montreal
Bishop of Moray and Ross (*a*)
Bishop of Nassau
Bishop of Norwich
Bishop of Olympia
Bishop of Ontario
Bishop of Pennsylvania
Bishop of Peterborough
Bishop of Pretoria

(*a*) Members of Sub-Committee on Episcopal Churches. The remainder formed the Sub-Committee on Non-Episcopal Churches.

Part I.

Report of the Whole Committee.

The reunion of the separated congregations of Christ's flock is fundamental to all the subjects dealt with by the Lambeth Conference. For the manifold witness of the Church would be intensified and extended beyond all measure if it came from an undivided Society of Jesus Christ. To restore the unity of this Society, therefore, would be to increase the effective force of this witness in every part of the world to a degree which in these days can be scarcely imagined. No one who is not blind to the signs which abound on every hand can doubt that the Spirit of God is moving in this direction in a way which must bring home to the authorities of all Christian Communions a deep sense of responsibility in the face of an opportunity which is almost without parallel in the history of the Church. It was with a full, and indeed an overwhelming, sense of this responsibility that the members of this Committee entered upon the task committed to it. In spite of the differences of opinion which we brought with us to the consideration of our subject we seemed to be guided towards an ideal of Christian unity which we have endeavoured to express in the Appeal which we place in the forefront of our resolutions. It appeared to us that we could best fulfil the duty laid upon us at this present time by placing this ideal before all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, in the hope that, if it be in accordance with God's will, it may by His blessing serve to inspire and guide a new and united movement towards the fulfilment of His purpose for the unity of His Church.

Names of Members of the Committee—*continued.*

Archbishop of Rupert's Land
Bishop of St. Albans
Bishop of St. Andrews
Bishop of St. David's
Bishop of St. John's (*a*)
Bishop of Salisbury
Bishop of Southern Brazil
Bishop of South Carolina
Bishop of Southern Ohio (*a*)
Bishop in South Tokyo
Archbishop of Sydney
Bishop of Tennessee
Bishop in Tinnevelly
Bishop of Truro (*a*) (*Secretary*)
Bishop of Uganda
Bishop of Waiapu
Bishop of Warrington
Bishop of Western New York
Bishop of Willesden (*a*)
Bishop Mott Williams* (*a*)
Bishop of Willochra
Bishop of Winchester
Archbishop of York (*Chairman*)
Bishop of Zanzibar

(*a*) Members of Sub-Committee on Episcopal Churches. The remainder formed the Sub-Committee on Non-Episcopal Churches.

We therefore venture to recommend that the Conference should adopt and send forth the following Appeal to all Christian people:

AN APPEAL TO ALL CHRISTIAN PEOPLE

FROM THE BISHOPS ASSEMBLED IN THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE OF 1920.

We, Archbishops, Bishops Metropolitan, and other Bishops of the Holy Catholic Church in full communion with the Church of England, in Conference assembled, realizing the responsibility which rests upon us at this time, and sensible of the sympathy and the prayers of many, both within and without our own Communion, make this appeal to all Christian people.

We acknowledge all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, and have been baptized into the name of the Holy Trinity, as sharing with us membership in the universal Church of Christ which is His Body. We believe that the Holy Spirit has called us in a very solemn and special manner to associate ourselves in penitence and prayer with all those who deplore the divisions of Christian people, and are inspired by the vision and hope of a visible unity of the whole Church.

I. We believe that God wills fellowship. By God's own act this fellowship was made in and through Jesus Christ, and its life is in His Spirit. We believe that it is God's purpose to manifest this fellowship, so far as this world is concerned, in an outward, visible, and united society, holding one faith, having its own recognized officers, using God-given means of grace, and inspiring all its members to the world-wide service of the Kingdom of God. This is what we mean by the Catholic Church.

II. This united fellowship is not visible in the world to-day. On the one hand there are other ancient episcopal Communions in East and West, to whom ours is bound by many ties of common faith and tradition. On the other hand there are the great non-episcopal Communions, standing for rich elements of truth, liberty and life which might otherwise have been obscured or neglected. With them we are closely linked by many affinities, racial, historical and spiritual. We cherish the earnest hope that all these Communions, and our own, may be led by the Spirit into the unity of the Faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God. But in fact we are all organized in different groups, each one keeping to itself gifts that rightly belong to the whole fellowship, and tending to live its own life apart from the rest.

III. The causes of division lie deep in the past, and are by no means simple or wholly blameworthy. Yet none can doubt that self-will, ambition, and lack of charity among Christians

have been principal factors in the mingled process, and that these, together with blindness to the sin of disunion, are still mainly responsible for the breaches of Christendom. We acknowledge this condition of broken fellowship to be contrary to God's will, and we desire frankly to confess our share in the guilt of thus crippling the Body of Christ and hindering the activity of His Spirit.

IV. The times call us to a new outlook and new measures. The Faith cannot be adequately apprehended and the battle of the Kingdom cannot be worthily fought while the body is divided, and is thus unable to grow up into the fulness of the life of Christ. The time has come, we believe, for all the separated groups of Christians to agree in forgetting the things which are behind and reaching out towards the goal of a reunited Catholic Church. The removal of the barriers which have arisen between them will only be brought about by a new comradeship of those whose faces are definitely set this way.

The vision which rises before us is that of a Church, genuinely Catholic, loyal to all Truth, and gathering into its fellowship all "who profess and call themselves Christians," within whose visible unity all the treasures of faith and order, bequeathed as a heritage by the past to the present, shall be possessed in common, and made serviceable to the whole Body of Christ. Within this unity Christian Communions now separated from one another would retain much that has long been distinctive in their methods of worship and service. It is through a rich diversity of life and devotion that the unity of the whole fellowship will be fulfilled.

V. This means an adventure of goodwill and still more of faith, for nothing less is required than a new discovery of the creative resources of God. To this adventure we are convinced that God is now calling all the members of His Church.

VI. We believe that the visible unity of the Church will be found to involve the whole-hearted acceptance of:—

The Holy Scriptures, as the record of God's revelation of Himself to man, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith; and the Creed commonly called Nicene, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith, and either it or the Apostles' Creed as the Baptismal confession of belief:

The divinely instituted sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion, as expressing for all the corporate life of the whole fellowship in and with Christ:

A ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body.

VII. May we not reasonably claim that the Episcopate is the one means of providing such a ministry? It is not that we

call in question for a moment the spiritual reality of the ministries of those Communions which do not possess the Episcopate. On the contrary we thankfully acknowledge that these ministries have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace. But we submit that considerations alike of history and of present experience justify the claim which we make on behalf of the Episcopate. Moreover, we would urge that it is now and will prove to be in the future the best instrument for maintaining the unity and continuity of the Church. But we greatly desire that the office of a Bishop should be everywhere exercised in a representative and constitutional manner, and more truly express all that ought to be involved for the life of the Christian Family in the title of Father-in-God. Nay more, we eagerly look forward to the day when through its acceptance in a united Church we may all share in that grace which is pledged to the members of the whole body in the apostolic rite of the laying-on of hands, and in the joy and fellowship of a Eucharist in which as one Family we may together, without any doubtfulness of mind, offer to the one Lord our worship and service.

VIII. We believe that for all the truly equitable approach to union is by the way of mutual deference to one another's consciences. To this end, we who send forth this appeal would say that if the authorities of other Communions should so desire, we are persuaded that, terms of union having been otherwise satisfactorily adjusted, Bishops and clergy of our Communion would willingly accept from these authorities a form of commission or recognition which would commend our ministry to their congregations, as having its place in the one family life. It is not in our power to know how far this suggestion may be acceptable to those to whom we offer it. We can only say that we offer it in all sincerity as a token of our longing that all ministries of grace, theirs and ours, shall be available for the service of our Lord in a united Church.

It is our hope that the same motive would lead ministers who have not received it to accept a commission through episcopal ordination, as obtaining for them a ministry throughout the whole fellowship.

In so acting no one of us could possibly be taken to repudiate his past ministry. God forbid that any man should repudiate a past experience rich in spiritual blessings for himself and others. Nor would any of us be dishonouring the Holy Spirit of God, Whose call led us all to our several ministries, and Whose power enabled us to perform them. We shall be publicly and formally seeking additional recognition of a new call to wider service in a reunited Church, and imploring for ourselves God's grace and strength to fulfil the same.

IX. The spiritual leadership of the Catholic Church in days to come, for which the world is manifestly waiting, depends

upon the readiness with which each group is prepared to make sacrifices for the sake of a common fellowship, a common ministry, and a common service to the world.

We place this ideal first and foremost before ourselves and our own people. We call upon them to make the effort to meet the demands of a new age with a new outlook. To all other Christian people whom our words may reach we make the same appeal. We do not ask that any one Communion should consent to be absorbed in another. We do ask that all should unite in a new and great endeavour to recover and to manifest to the world the unity of the Body of Christ for which He prayed.

The Lambeth Conference of 1908 passed the following resolution (No. 78) " The constituted authorities of the various Churches of the Anglican Communion should, as opportunity offers, arrange conferences with representatives of other Christian Churches, and meetings for common acknowledgement of the sins of division, and for intercession for the growth of unity."

In another part of this Report it is shewn that in many countries, particularly in the United States of America, in India, and in Africa, this course has been very largely followed But the urgency of the present world situation, and the wide and deep longing for unity which these Conferences have revealed, and which fills the hearts of Christian people throughout the world, seem to us to call for further and more responsible action. We ask the Conference to recommend that the authorities of the Churches of the Anglican Communion should, in such ways and at such times as they think best, formally invite the authorities of other Churches within their areas to confer with them as to the posssibility of taking definite steps to co-operate in a common endeavour, on the lines set forth in the Appeal, to restore the unity of the Church of Christ. It may be that these approaches will meet with some rebuffs and disappointments. Special circumstances may be urged as shewing that such conferences would be premature. Some doors seem for the present to be shut. But many doors in all parts of the world are open. There are already movements in progress for a closer union of Communions separated from us and from one another. With the spirit and hopes of these movements we would associate ourselves, heartily desiring their success and trusting that they may forward the cause of the ultimate union of the universal Church. Yet the historical traditions and the spiritual sympathies of the Anglican Church seem to lay upon us a special duty, which at this present time we ought to accept as a definite call of God. May He in His mercy forgive and take from us any spirit of self-satisfaction ! We have need frankly to acknowledge and humbly to confess our manifold sins and shortcomings as a Church. In all our approaches to our fellow Christians of other Churches we shall

try to make it plain that we only desire to be permitted to take our part with them in a cause to which the Lord Whom we serve is at this time most manifestly calling all the members of His Church.

Here it will not be out of place to draw the attention of our fellow-churchmen to some important results of the extension and development of the Anglican Communion, and the bearing of these upon the question of reunion and upon our attitude and duty towards it.

At the date of the first Lambeth Conference, 1867, this Communion had taken the form of a federation of self-governing Churches, held together for the most part without legal sanctions by a common reverence for the same traditions and a common use of a Prayer Book which, in spite of some local variations, was virtually the same. Our missionary workers were then planting churches among nations very different from the Anglo-Saxon race and from one another, but as yet these had shewn but little growth. In the interval between that time and the present there have grown up indigenous Churches in China, in Japan, in East and West Africa, in each of which the English members are but a handful of strangers and sojourners, some engaged in missionary work, some in secular business. In India the Church includes large numbers both of British and of Indian members: the emergence of a National Church, claiming freedom to regulate its own affairs, is only a matter of time. Consequently the Anglican Communion of to-day is a federation of Churches, some national, some regional, but no longer predominantly Anglo-Saxon in race, nor can it be expected that it will attach special value to Anglo-Saxon traditions. The blessing which has rested upon its work has brought it to a new point of view. Meanwhile, it might also be said that its centre of gravity is shifting. It already presents an example on a small scale of the problems which attach to the unity of a Universal Church. As the years go on, its ideals must become less Anglican and more Catholic. It cannot look to any bonds of union holding it together, other than those which should hold together the Catholic Church itself.

While this development has been going on, another has kept pace with it. Our Communion has taken into itself, tried, and found valuable many elements which were not to be found in any effective condition in the Church of England one hundred or even fifty years ago. The bearing of these on the problem of reunion is so important that we deem it worth while to notice here some examples. In most parts of our Communion the Episcopate does not even present the appearance of autocracy or prelacy. Various arrangements have been adopted by which the Bishop is elected by the Diocese over which he is to preside. The affairs of the Diocese are managed by the Bishop in conjunction with a Diocesan Synod or Council. The Bishops and

their Dioceses are further correlated in Provincial and General Synods, Conventions or Assemblies. Thus, Episcopacy among us has generally become constitutional, and the clergy and laity have attained to a share in the government of the Church. Again, in many parts of our Communion systems of patronage have been adopted which recognize the right of congregations to take part in the selection of their ministers. We draw attention to these matters as evidencing our recognition, not only in word but in deed, of the value of some of those elements of Church life which those now separated from us have developed with marked success. We would urge further on our own fellow-churchmen that it is one of the most pressing and most important steps towards reunion that they should develop in every place, according to its own circumstances and the genius of its people, the well-tried principles of constitutionalism in the government of the Church, and of the full employment of every member in its life, and the Committee venture to submit a Resolution to this effect to the Conference.

There are other signs of similar expansion from within, which have made our Communion more representative of the varying phases of Christian life and devotion. The development of mission services and missions of many kinds, the use of various additional forms of prayer, of *ex tempore* prayer, of silent prayer, and again of various kinds of ceremonial and elaboration of liturgical worship, testify, quite apart from the merits of any of them, to the increasing recognition of the diversity of the temperaments of men and of the duty of the Church to make them all feel at home in the family of God. We welcome the spirit of that expansion which has brought one part or another of our Communion nearer to those who are separated from us. We look forward hopefully to the far greater variety in the expression of the one faith and of devotion to the one Lord, which must necessarily ensue when the Churches of men who are strangers in blood, though brothers in Christ, come to fuller age and to more characteristic development. We call upon our fellow-churchmen in every branch of our Communion to accept ever more fully the standard of the universal Church and its necessary inclusiveness, so that they will not feel strange when they are called upon to live in the fellowship of the re-united universal Church.

Meanwhile, the needs of the whole world lay upon Christian men and women everywhere the obligation to manifest the fellowship which they already possess as believers in the one Lord, and as the soldiers and servants of His Kingdom, by praying and working together for the vindication of the Christian Faith and the extension of the rule of Christ among all nations and over every region of human life. We therefore recommend that,

where it has not already been done, Councils representing all Christian Communions should be formed within such areas as may be deemed most convenient, as centres of united effort to promote the physical, moral and social welfare of the people and the spread of the Kingdom of God and of His righteousness among men. Such co-operation will, we are confident, both strengthen the desire and prepare the way for a fuller spiritual union of life and worship.

Part II.

Report of the Sub-Committee (*b*) on Relation to and Reunion with Non-Episcopal Churches.

[Note.—*In view of the fact that the report of Sub-Committee* (b) *on Non-Episcopal Churches is specially based upon the Appeal to all Christian People, and repeatedly refers to it, it is here placed before the report of Sub-Committee* (a) *on Episcopal Churches.*]

We first pass in review the movements towards reunion in which the Anglican Churches have recently been involved.

The character of the movement towards reunion with non-episcopal Churches since the last Lambeth Conference has been dramatic and impressive. This is notably true of the movement in the American Church in 1910, resulting in the proposals for a World Conference on Questions of Faith and Order, which shall represent all Christians and which has already secured the interest and co-operation of many Christian bodies throughout the world. Further, in almost every section of the Anglican Communion conferences with other Churches have been held, in not a few cases definite proposals have been made, and in others actual schemes set forth. Of this we have received striking illustrations. They range from simple conferences where differences have been discussed and lines of agreement indicated, to definite proposals where substantial agreement has been obtained. In the first category are to be found the important first and second Interim Reports of the English Joint Sub-Committee appointed in connexion with the World Conference on Faith and Order, to which our Appeal, as set forth above, is greatly indebted. In addition to these, conferences between leading members of our Church and leaders of non-episcopal Churches have been held at Oxford and elsewhere; by chaplains and Y.M.C.A. workers in France; and by the Bishop of London with members of the Wesleyan Church; while the Convocations of both Canterbury and York have had under consideration certain proposals relating to united fellowship and worship.

All these witness to the deep and earnest longing in the hearts of all Christian men to draw nearer to each other and, if possible, to find some solution of the difficulties which now stand in the way of visible union. Moreover, they all reveal a far greater measure of agreement, as to both faith and order, than is generally supposed to exist.

It is, however, in the more defined and official proposals for union that we perceive how great is the progress which has been attained.

Of these proposals the following have been specially brought before us for consideration.

In the United States of America a Concordat has been proposed by members of the Protestant Episcopal Church and Ministers of Congregational Churches. These proposals were presented to the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church at Detroit in October, 1919. A series of resolutions was concurred in by both the House of Deputies and the House of Bishops, and a proposed canon has been drawn up. The whole matter is to be considered at the next General Convention which meets in 1922.

In South India a proposed union of the Anglican Church with the South India United Church (which includes five separate non-episcopal missions) has reached a stage at which the proposals may shortly be brought before the Episcopal Synod of the Province of India and Ceylon.

In East Africa a Constitution of an Alliance of Missionary Societies has been adopted, and the Members of the Alliance declare that they "pledge themselves not to rest until they can all share one Ministry."

In Australia proposals, having as their object a union with the Presbyterians, have been under consideration, and several conferences have been held with representatives of other non-Episcopal churches. Much will depend upon the decisions of this Conference as to the possibility of further progress in this region.

We have also received communications from Canada and China indicating the earnest desire of the Churches in both these parts of the world that definite steps in the cause of reunion may be taken.

The information which we have thus briefly summarized shews most impressively the strength of the tide which is everywhere setting towards a new Christian fellowship, but with equal impressiveness it shews the widely differing problems which the Churches of the Anglican Communion throughout the world are called to face. The conditions of national and religious life in regions so diverse as, for example, India, China, East Africa, Australia, the United States of America, Canada, Scotland and England, are obviously wholly different. There must be a corresponding variety in the ways along which union among

Christian people in these countries can be either approached or carried through. We therefore unanimously submit to the Conference the two following Resolutions :—

That this Conference desires to express its profound thankfulness for the important movements towards Unity which during the last twelve years have taken place in many parts of the world, and for the earnest desire for Reunion which has been manifested both in our own Communion and among the Churches now separated from us.

That this Conference confidently commits to the various authorities of the Churches within the Anglican Communion the task of effecting union with other Christian Communions on lines that are in general harmony with the principles underlying its proposals and resolutions.

We cannot insist too strongly that the resolutions which we now submit must be read and understood in the light of the ideal and principles of union which are set forth in the appeal which we have asked the Conference to issue. Taken by themselves they would inevitably misrepresent the warmth of desire and strength of hope by which we are animated. They must be regarded as counsels which the Conference may rightly be expected to give to the authorities of Churches in the Anglican Communion who desire to be guided aright in their efforts to set forward the cause of Christian Unity.

We consider that when men set their faces steadily towards the ideal of our appeal, and specially when negotiations for organic reunion are in progress or again when a scheme of union has in any place been adopted, situations will arise in which we should all agree that new lines of action may be followed. In regard to such situations, we submit to the Conference the following Resolutions :—

That a Bishop is justified in giving occasional authorization to ministers, not episcopally ordained, who in his judgement are working towards an ideal of union such as is described in our Appeal, to preach in churches within his Diocese, and to clergy of the Diocese to preach in the churches of such ministers.

That Bishops of the Anglican Communion will not question the action of any Bishop who, in the few years during which a definite scheme of union is maturing, shall countenance the irregularity of admitting to Communion the baptized but unconfirmed Communicants of the non-episcopal congregations concerned in the scheme.

Further, we deem it necessary in order that negotiations for union shall be steps towards and not away from our ideal, to express our dissent from certain proposals which have been, or might be, made, and which seem to us likely to obscure our ideal

or to hinder its fulfilment. Moreover, we deprecate such proposals as likely to prevent the members of our own Communion from forwarding the work of reunion with that enthusiastic unanimity with which it ought to be pursued. In these connexions we submit to the Conference the following Resolutions :—

That this Conference cannot approve of general schemes of intercommunion or exchange of pulpits.

That in accordance with the principle of Church order set forth in the Preface to the Ordinal attached to the Book of Common Prayer the Conference cannot approve the Celebration in Anglican churches of the Holy Communion for members of the Anglican Church by ministers who have not been episcopally ordained, and declares that the same principle requires that it should be regarded as the general rule of the Church that Anglican communicants should receive Holy Communion only at the hands of ministers of their own Church, or of Churches in communion therewith.

The general subject of the admission to Holy Communion of persons who do not belong to any Church in communion with us has been confused by certain doubts and varieties of practice on which we deem it desirable that this Conference should express its opinion. In this regard we submit to the Conference the following Resolutions which we believe to be applicable at all times, and not only in view of the approach of reunion :—

That no priest has canonical authority to refuse Communion to any baptized person kneeling before the Lord's Table, unless he be excommunicate by name, or, in the canonical sense of the term, a cause of scandal to the faithful.

Nothing in these Resolutions is intended to indicate that the rule of Confirmation as conditioning admission to the Holy Communion must necessarily apply to the case of baptized persons who seek Communion under conditions which in the Bishop's judgement justify their admission thereto.

It is plainly impossible to draft Resolutions which would meet every case that might arise anywhere in the course of negotiations for union or to suggest terms of union to meet every contingency. Great freedom must be left to the local negotiators, though in the exercise of it they must remember that similar negotiations in other places will be affected by what they do. Too great independence of action in one place may compromise action already taken elsewhere in stricter conformity with the words of the foregoing resolutions. No Communion, whether our own or another, conducting negotiations in several places, will consent to seriously divergent treatment of points which it counts fundamental.

With these considerations in mind we offer suggestions on

one case, at the request of some of our number. Some Provinces of our Communion, while agreeing to unite with a non-episcopal Communion on the basis of the acceptance of Episcopacy for the future, might be faced with the necessity of providing for the contingency that many ministers who at the time of the union were working in the non-episcopal Communion, would remain after the union without episcopal ordination. The following suggestions appear to us to satisfy the conditions of local freedom explained above :—

(*a*) Ministers of both the uniting Communions should be at once recognized as of equal status in all Synods and Councils of the United Church.

(*b*) The terms of union should not confer on non-episcopally ordained ministers the right to administer the Holy Communion to those congregations which already possess an episcopal ministry, but they should include the right to conduct other services and to preach in such churches, if licensed thereto by the Bishop.

(*c*) All other matters might well be left to the decision of the Provincial or General Synods of the United Church, in full confidence that these Synods will take care not to endanger that fellowship with the universal Church which is our common ultimate aim.

The Committee asks the Conference to pass a Resolution of general approval of these suggestions.

Our brethren who have the responsibility of carrying through any such negotiations may be assured of our confidence in their loyalty, and of the support of the continuing prayer and sympathy which will follow them in their venture.

In concluding our Report we think it only right to state at the request of some of our number that, with regard to the precise phrasing and practical effect of some of the Resolutions which we have submitted to the Conference, there was considerable difference of opinion. They were finally accepted as representing the measure of general agreement which in the present circumstances we judged to be attainable in our Communion as a whole and on which alone counsel could fitly be based for the guidance of Bishops in the exercise of their own responsibility. But this very pressure of inevitable differences and difficulties called out among men widely sundered in opinion a spirit of patience, consideration, and unity for which we desire reverently to offer our thanksgiving to Him from Whom cometh down every good and perfect gift.

Part III.

Report of the Sub-Committee (*a*) on Relation to and Reunion with Episcopal Churches.

The Latin Communion.

Your Committee feels that it is impossible to make any Report on Reunion with Episcopal Churches without some reference to the Church of Rome, even though it has no resolution to propose upon the subject. We cannot do better than make our own the words of the Report of 1908, which reminds us of "the fact that there can be no fulfilment of the Divine purpose in any scheme of reunion which does not ultimately include the great Latin Church of the West, with which our history has been so closely associated in the past, and to which we are still bound by many ties of common faith and tradition." But we realize that—to continue the quotation—"any advance in this direction is at present barred by difficulties which we have not ourselves created, and which we cannot of ourselves remove." Should, however, the Church of Rome at any time desire to discuss conditions of reunion we shall be ready to welcome such discussions. We desire, moreover, very briefly to indicate that there are movements going on in the Church of Rome which may be fruitful in the future. There have been discussions in strict Roman Catholic circles in France as to the possibility of setting up an independent Gallican Church. The establishment of Houses of several of the Religious Orders at Oxford, and the part taken by their members in the discussions of theological societies there, together with their readiness to lecture at the "Summer School of Theology" which is entirely interdenominational, bear striking witness to the far greater freedom with which they enter into the intellectual life and interests of the Universities than formerly; while the appearance of a work entitled "The Problem of Reunion," by a former Professor of Stonyhurst, is not without significance. A few years ago there would have been no "Problem"; and though the writer maintains the traditional Roman position, he shews a marked difference, in tone and temperament, from what we have been accustomed to. They are also ready to join with us on a common platform in social and civic matters. Further, in spite of the official attitude taken by the Roman Church to our own with regard to religious ministrations during the war—an attitude which we greatly deplore—the personal relations, which obtained between their Chaplains and ours in France and else-

where, were often of the pleasantest character and led to a greatly increased knowledge and understanding of each other's position. It is obvious that no forward step can be taken yet ; but the facts thus referred to may help to create in the future a very different position.

In what follows we desire to say how greatly we are indebted to the work of the last Lambeth Conference, and to the Reports of the several Committees appointed after its close. Lines of advance in various directions were then laid down, and along these lines the Committees made real progress. It would have been quite impossible for us in the time at our disposal to fulfil the task imposed upon us had it not been for this. We have for the most part taken up the work at the point at which they were compelled to leave it. We have not attempted to go behind their conclusions, or examine afresh the evidence upon which they based them ; but, accepting them, we have worked upon them and have thus endeavoured to carry matters forward a stage nearer to the goal at which we are aiming.

I

The Orthodox Eastern Church.

We will begin by speaking about the Church of Russia. During the earlier years after the last Lambeth Conference our relations with this Church were probably closer than with any other branch of the Eastern Church, nor were they interfered with in the first years of the War, and after the Revolution in 1917 it was hoped that the internal reforms which the Russian Church—set free from State dominance, and adapting itself to the new conditions of life—was endeavouring to introduce, might bring about still closer relations with us. This hope seemed to be confirmed by the fact that one of the last acts of the "Great Sobor" (Council) summoned by the Holy Synod was in September, 1918, to pass a resolution, welcoming "the sincere efforts of the Old Catholics and Anglicans towards union with the Orthodox Church," and calling on the sacred Synod "to organize a permanent commission with departments in Russia and abroad for the further study of Old Catholic and Anglican difficulties in the way of union, and for the furthering, as much as possible, of the speedy attainment of the final aim." Scarcely was this resolution passed before the Church in Russia was subjected to a renewed persecution, the horrors of which have hardly ever been exceeded. This is not the place to dwell on the martyrdoms of sixty bishops and hundreds of priests and other

persons. The memory of these things is in all our minds; nor can we forget the way in which the Russian Church then turned to England, or the pathetic appeals addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury for help and protection. The Conference will, we believe, desire to pass a resolution expressing its intense sympathy with the Russian Church in the terrible trials to which it has been and apparently still is being subjected. We therefore append one to this Report. Even now the position in Russia is far from clear. Information filters through but slowly. But one thing seems to stand out as certain, *viz.*, that in the wreck and ruin of all other institutions, the Church, albeit stripped and despoiled, alone has survived, though sorely hampered and hindered in the performance of its work, and we believe that when the opportunity for reconstructing its proper organization is given to it, it will once again look to establish the friendliest relations with the Anglican Church, relations which we trust and pray may be more intimate than ever.

With the Church of Serbia we must also express our deep sympathy, in view of the calamities and special difficulties which the War brought upon it. In its hour of trial it turned to England for help which was readily extended, and it has been a particular privilege for Church people in England to assist in the reconstruction of the Serbian Church. The entire body of Serbian students for Holy Orders were at one time receiving their education under the auspices of the Church of England at Oxford, Cuddesdon, and elsewhere, while every care was taken to maintain full loyalty to the Serbian Church. Thus the closest relations were established between members of the two Churches, largely through the instrumentality of Father Nicholai Velimirovic, now Bishop of Zicha. At the present moment a number of Serbian students for Holy Orders are receiving their training in America, and the same cordial relationships are in existence there. These things mark a stage in the direction of reunion, the full results of which will be increasingly manifest in years to come.

In Greece also, and indeed in all parts of the East, the War has profoundly affected our relations with the Orthodox Church. It has brought the Anglican and Eastern Churches much nearer to each other. We hear from many different places of remarkable instances of what we may call informal acts of intercommunion in emergencies which would have been quite impossible a few years ago, and which shew the close sympathy there is between the two Churches. The War has changed the attitude of the East to Western Christendom. We are told that there is a great turning to England and America, and a desire to know more about us and our Communion, about which there is still too little known in the East generally. But partly because of the position of England in the War, and because of belief in its power, there has been a real stretching out of hands and a desire

shewn in more than one quarter to learn and make advances towards us. It is well understood by this time in the East that we have no ulterior aims in seeking closer relations with them, and we are free from the suspicion of any attempt to proselytize, an attempt which naturally they would bitterly resent. During these last few years we have had several visits to our shores from distinguished Eastern prelates, and important Conferences have been held both in this country and in America for the discussion of doctrinal questions. We note also the cordial reception accorded to the Bishop of London and others in their visits to the East, and in particular the position assigned at the Liturgy to the Bishop of Gibraltar and the Bishop of Harrisburg, which seems to have gone beyond the extension of ordinary courtesies. These things will bear fruit in years to come. Another welcome sign of East and West drawing closer together is found in the letter from the *Locum tenens* of the Œcumenical Patriarchate at Constantinople "unto all the Churches of Christ wheresoever they be," which was sent from the Phanar to the Archbishop of Canterbury. Chief in importance, however, has been the visit of a special delegation from the Œcumenical Patriarchate to London, for purposes of consultation with Bishops attending the Lambeth Conference on relations between the Orthodox and Anglican Communions. This visit was the result of a formal invitation from the Archbishop of Canterbury to the *Locum tenens* of the Œcumenical Patriarchate at Constantinople. To this visit we have reason to attach the greatest importance. The delegation, consisting of Philaretos the Metropolitan of Demotica, Professor Komninos of Halki, the Archimandrite Pagonis of London, and the Archpriest Callinicos of Manchester, was welcomed by the President in full session of the Conference, and your Committee has had the advantage of more than one conference with it, at which important questions, doctrinal and practical, were discussed and full consideration given to the matters specified in the letter from the Phanar referred to above, in which letter we would call special attention to the desire expressed for immediate co-operation in matters of social reform.

Along the lines here briefly indicated we believe that we are steadily moving towards the goal of ultimate reunion. But there is much still to be done before this is reached, and our progress will be not less sure because it is slow. We still require to gain greater knowledge and understanding of each other's position. Explanations are needed on both sides, and it is clear that when the day comes for definite proposals of formal intercommunion to be made, they will have to be based on a large-hearted tolerance on both sides, and a readiness on the part of each Church to be content with holding its own uses and practices without attempting to ask for conformity to them on the part of the other.

Meanwhile, we look for much from the Eastern Churches Committee recently appointed on a permanent basis by the Archbishop of Canterbury in pursuance of Resolution 61 of the last Lambeth Conference. We are glad to learn that this action has been met by the appointment of somewhat similar Committees both at Constantinople and at Athens. The American Church has also appointed a permanent Commission to confer with the Eastern Churches. We believe that through the action of these Committees further important steps towards reunion may be taken, partly by the free discussion of doctrinal matters, *e.g.*, the meaning of the Filioque clause, as not involving any belief on our part in more than one *αἰτία* in the Godhead, our doctrine of holy orders, the position of the XXXIX Articles, on all of which matters the Easterns are asking for information, and partly also by conference on practical matters of moment, such as the better regulation of mixed marriages, the reciprocal administration of the Sacraments in cases of emergency, a uniform Kalendar, possibly involving the appointment of a fixed Easter, and other questions raised in the letter from the Phanar.

We need at the present time not only or chiefly to afford to the Easterns historical evidence of the handing down of our ministry, but also to explain the doctrinal position held by our Communion. It is in particular of the first importance, in order to remove Oriental misconceptions, to make it clear from our formularies that we regard Ordination as conferring grace, and not only as a mere setting apart to an ecclesiastical office. It would also (though in a lesser degree) be a help, as well as a good thing in itself, to restore the true text of the " Nicene " Creed, as it is used in all parts of the East and West, except in our Communion, by replacing the word " Holy " before " Catholic and Apostolic Church."

If some members of the Eastern Churches' Committee could visit Athens or Constantinople for conferences to be held there, such as those already held in this country and in America, we believe that they would not only meet with a cordial welcome, but also be able to do much to remove misconceptions, and to prepare the way for the ultimate reunion which both Churches alike so earnestly desire, and for which they make their constant prayer.

II.

The Separated Churches of the East.

Since the last Lambeth Conference further steps have been taken towards a better understanding of, and in some cases a nearer relation to, those Ancient Churches of the East which by

reason mainly of the Christological dissensions of the Fifth century have been separated from the rest of Christianity. But the persecutions which many of them, notably the Armenians, Nestorians, and Syrian Jacobites, have been called upon to suffer, both before and during the Great War, and the terrible massacres that have taken place among them, have prevented as great progress being made as might have been hoped. That they have so greatly suffered for the Christian faith and have refused to apostatize from it under persecution is a fact which must call for our deepest sympathy and respect.

These Churches have all at some period of their history been accused of theological error with regard to the Incarnation, and it is, therefore, necessary that we should examine with some care their doctrinal position at the present time. The Lambeth Conference of 1908 desired the formation of Commissions to do this, and "to prepare some carefully framed statement of the faith as to our Lord's Person, in the simplest possible terms, which should be submitted to each of such Churches where feasible, in order to ascertain whether it represents their belief with substantial accuracy." Further, the Conference suggested that if such a statement were found to be acceptable to any such Church occasional intercommunion might be advantageously provided for. A Commission was formed, and proceeded to take action with reference to the *East Syrian, Assyrian,* or *Nestorian Church;* and it resolved that the statement of Catholic doctrine to be submitted to this Church, or to any other that lay under analogous suspicion of error as to the Incarnation, should be the Christological versicles of the Quicunque Vult. The Commission also resolved to ask the East Syrian Church to explain in what sense it used the term "Mother of Christ" as its technical description of the Blessed Virgin Mary. The Archbishop of Canterbury wrote to this effect to the now deceased Patriarch Benjamin Mar Shimun, Catholicos of the East, who, after consultation with his bishops, and with their assent, returned answer under date June 13th, 1911, entirely accepting the statement of faith propounded to him, as expressing the belief of that Church, and giving an explanation of the use of the term "Mother of Christ" which was considered entirely satisfactory by the Commission. With this judgement your present Committee agree.

It was, however, more important still that a careful examination of the East Syrian voluminous liturgical books should be made. This has been done, with the result that it is seen that they contain much that is incompatible with real Nestorianism, together with some things that might be interpreted either in an orthodox or in a Nestorian sense; it is suggested that the latter must be judged by the former. The watchword Theotokos is absent from their service books, and in one place is repudiated;

on the other hand, its equivalent in other words is several times found, and strong instances of the language known as *communicatio idiomatum* occur. One phrase, which has caused some perplexity, is that which asserts that there are in Christ one parṣōpā (πρόσωπον), two Qnōmé, and two natures. The word Qnōmā is equivalent to "hypostasis," and if used in the later sense of that word, *i.e.* as meaning "person," it would imply real Nestorianism; but research has made it plain that it is used in the earlier sense of "hypostasis," namely, "substance," and this makes the phrase, if redundant, at least perfectly orthodox. It should be added that the East Syrians accept the decrees of Chalcedon, while rejecting those of Ephesus.

Your Committee agree with the Commission in thinking that we need not insist on the East Syrian Church ceasing to mention in their services the names of those whom it has hitherto revered.

They suggest that if the Archbishop of Canterbury finds that the present East Syrian authorities adhere to the answer given in 1911, there is no reason why occasional intercommunion should not be established. They also think that opportunity should be taken to inform the authorities of the Eastern Orthodox Churches about these proposals.

The Jacobites or West Syrians.—Since the last Lambeth Conference the Jacobite Patriarch, Mar Ignatius Abdullah II, has visited this country. His interview with the late Bishop of Salisbury (Dr. J. Wordsworth) at the end of 1908 gives us much information as to the doctrinal position of his Church; in particular he called attention to the *Statement of Faith*, or Creed, of which an English translation was published by the Syrian Patriarchate Education Committee in 1908, and by Dr. Wordsworth in 1909, as being a very ancient and authoritative document by which his Church was solemnly bound. This *Statement of Faith* denies that the divine nature of our Lord was commingled with the human nature, or that the two natures became commixed and changed so as to give rise to a third nature, and asserts that the two natures became united in indissoluble union without confusion, mixture, or transmutation, and that they remained two natures in an unalterable unity (§ 12). The *Statement of Faith* is quite free from Monophysitism, and contains the emphatic assertion that the Trisagion as recited by the Jacobites, with the addition of "who wast crucified for us"—an addition long looked on as a strong mark of error—is addressed, not to the Holy Trinity, but solely "to the only-begotten Son, the Word, who was pleased to be born of the Holy Virgin Mary and became flesh" (§ 22).

Your Committee regretfully recognize that the present moment, when under the draft Turkish Treaty the West Syrians remain under Turkish rule, is not specially suitable for endeavouring to establish closer relations with them; but suggest that the

recently appointed Eastern Churches Committee should watch for any suitable opportunity for doing so, and that when such opportunity arises, the above considerations will greatly diminish any doctrinal difficulties. In the meantime a great desideratum is a better knowledge of the Jacobite liturgical books, which are mostly in manuscript.

Copts and Abyssinians.—The above-mentioned Patriarch, Mar Ignatius Abdullah, stated that there is free intercourse between West Syrians, Armenians, Copts, and Abyssinians. In view of this fact any problems as to nearer relations between them and ourselves would be greatly simplified. At any moment opportunities of closer official relations with the Copts may arise, and in view of them your Committee suggest the desirability of a more thorough examination of their service books than has yet been made.

The Armenians.—This great and much-suffering Church has always repudiated charges of Eutychianism or of Monophysitism, and it is probable that their refusal to accept the decrees of Chalcedon is due to their having been prevented by political causes from being present at that Council, and to its decisions having reached them in a faulty version. Your Committee would express the hope that by the speedy development of mutual intercourse and investigation, closer relations may be established between them and ourselves, and that the Eastern Churches Committee should be asked to take notice of any suitable opportunity in this direction.

The Christians of St. Thomas in Malabar.—In so far as these Christians give allegiance to the West or East Syrians, the remarks made about those Churches apply here. In another part of this report reference is made to a large scheme of reunion which is being discussed in Southern India, and is intended to include some at least of these Christians.

Your Committee would suggest that it is not necessary, even if it were possible, to determine how far the Separated Churches of the East have been in the past really implicated in the errors which have been attributed to them; but they think that the investigations of the last twelve years have gone a great way to shew that they have at any rate grown out of any errors they may have held on the Person and Natures of our Lord. The more this is made clear, the more it will appear to be possible to arrive at occasional intercommunion, at the least. But it is desirable that an endeavour should be made, as we move forward step by step in this direction, to explain our attitude carefully to the authorities of the Orthodox Eastern Church, that all misconceptions with regard to the subject on the part of that great Communion may be removed. Indeed, we have good reason to believe that such action as is here indicated would in no ways prejudice our relations with the Orthodox.

III.

The Church of Sweden.

In consequence of Resolution 74 of the last Lambeth Conference a Commission was appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1909 under the chairmanship of the Bishop of Winchester (Dr. Ryle) to correspond with the Swedish Church on the possibility suggested by the Archbishop of Upsala (Dr. Ekman) of an "alliance of some sort" between the Swedish and Anglican Churches. In the autumn of the same year the Commission visited Sweden and held an important Conference with distinguished representatives of the Swedish Church. At this Conference explanations were given with regard to the Episcopal succession in both countries and with regard to other matters which required elucidation, and a Committee was appointed by the Archbishop of Upsala to act with him for the purpose of continuing if necessary the discussions initiated in the Conference. In the following year Bishop John Wordsworth delivered his memorable "Hale Lectures" (published in 1911) on "The National Church of Sweden." In the same year was also published a learned work by another member of the Anglican Commission, *viz.*, Bishop Mott Williams (then Bishop of Marquette), on "The Church of Sweden and the Anglican Communion." These two volumes dealt fully with the question of the succession of Swedish orders, and did much to remove the doubts previously felt on this subject in some quarters. In the course of the next year (1911) the Archbishop's Commission made its formal report, in which it stated the following conclusions, arrived at after full consideration of the evidence laid before it:—"(1) That the succession of bishops has been maintained unbroken by the Church of Sweden, and that it has a true conception of the episcopal office . . . and (2) that the office of priest is also rightly conceived as a divinely instituted instrument for the ministry of Word and Sacraments, and that it has been in intention handed on throughout the whole history of the Church of Sweden."

Accepting these conclusions, they based on them a recommendation that a resolution should be proposed, similar to that which was adopted by the Lambeth Conference of 1888 in reference to the Old Catholics of Germany, Austria, and Switzerland, under which members of the National Church of Sweden, otherwise qualified to receive the Sacrament in their own Church, might be admitted to Communion in ours. They also suggested that "permission might with advantage occasionally be given to Swedish ecclesiastics to give addresses in our churches," and that "notice should be sent to the Archbishop of Upsala of important events or appointments within the Church of England,

and that we should welcome similar information on his part "—a suggestion which, we understand, has been already to some extent acted upon. Further, they said that "as regards facilities for the use of churches for marriages, burials, and the like where Swedish churches are not available, we believe that concession on this head is within the competence of any diocesan bishop, and we trust that such facilities may be generally granted."

We accept the conclusions arrived at by the learned men who formed this Commission, on the unbroken succession of the Episcopate in Sweden, and on the conception of the office of priest held by that Church; and we recommend to the Conference the adoption of the definite recommendations cited above. We also hold that the time has come when, in the event of an invitation to an Anglican bishop or bishops to take part in the consecration of a Swedish bishop, it might properly be accepted. Such an invitation was, we understand, actually made in the year 1914, but it was then thought that the time had not come for such action, as the Report of the Commission had not been then before the Lambeth Conference. This reason no longer exists, and in the event of our resolutions based on this Report being approved, we believe that there need be hesitation no longer. Only we would add the recommendation that the acceptance of any such invitation should be subject to the approval of the Metropolitan of the Province, so that the invitation might be considered as one made from Church to Church, and not simply as a personal matter. We think also that in the first instance, as an evident token of the restoration of close relations between the two Churches, it is desirable that more than one of our bishops should take part in the action.

We ought not to conclude this section of our Report without stating that we are fully aware that in regard to the Diaconate and the administration of Confirmation the Swedish Church does not conform to the practice required within the Anglican Communion. But we have come to the conclusion that this fact ought not to be allowed to be a bar to such more intimate relations as we recommend. We express a hope, however, that as a result of the closer intimacy which we desire to be established, an intimacy which is happily encouraged and fostered by the presence of many Swedish students in this country, the Swedish Church may be led to consider the restoration of the Diaconate, and also of the laying-on of hands as an outward sign of grace given in Confirmation.*

* The subjects of the diaconate and Confirmation were considered at the Conference at Upsala in 1909. See the *Report of the Commission*, pp. 10, 11. Reference may also be made to Bishop Wordsworth's *Hale Lectures*, pp. 354–55, and 417–18, and Bishop Mott Williams' *The Church of Sweden and the Anglican Communion*, pp. 66–81.

We have said nothing in this Report of the other Scandinavian Churches, *viz.* those of Denmark, Norway, and Finland; not from any lack of sympathy or of desire for closer relations with them, but because the problem in their case is different from that in the case of the Church of Sweden, and because we believe that the time has not yet come for such negotiations to be entered into with them as are now proceeding with the Swedish Church. We hold, therefore, that at present it is wise to be content with aiming at closer alliance with the last-named Church alone.

IV.

The Old Catholics.

The "friendly relations" with the Old Catholics referred to in Resolution 68 of the last Lambeth Conference were steadily carried on, until the outbreak of the War in 1914 rendered communications and intercourse with them very difficult, and in some places quite impossible. Even now, although hostilities have ceased for more than a year and a half, the disturbed and unsettled condition of a large part of Europe remains a great hindrance to intercourse. We look forward, however, hopefully to a resumption in the near future of such happy relations as existed before the war, and it is a hopeful sign that the Old Catholic Bishops have quite recently been able for the first time for several years to meet together in Conference. Mention should also be made here of the remarkable rise of the Mariaviten Church in Poland, which has naturally suffered greatly during the War, and of the recent movement for reforms of various kinds within the Roman Catholic Church in Czecho-Slovakia, a movement the course of which we shall watch with interest.

In Resolution 69 of 1908 the Conference deprecated "the setting up of a new organised body in regions where a Church with apostolic ministry and Catholic doctrine offers religious privileges without the imposition of uncatholic terms of communion." The occasion which called forth this resolution was the consecration, at Utrecht on April 28th, 1908, of the Rev. A. H. Mathew by the Old Catholic Bishops for work in this country; and the resolution was at the request of the Conference communicated to the Archbishop of Utrecht by the Archbishop of Canterbury. Your Committee note with thankfulness that, in reply to this, explanations were offered by the Archbishop of Utrecht, and a promise made that in future they "would take care not to make trouble by encroaching on the order of a friendly Church." This statement has quite recently been followed up by a formal pronouncement by the Old Catholic

Bishops assembled at Utrecht on April 28th and 29th, 1920, in which they state categorically that the episcopal consecration of the Rev. A. H. Mathew "was surreptitiously secured by the production of false testimony, and would never have taken place had the consecrators known that the conditions stated in the questionable documents and required by our Episcopate were non-existent." They also state that on the discovery of the facts they "broke off intercourse with him," and "without entering on the question whether an ordination obtained by sacrilegious fraud can be valid" declare that they "have no ecclesiastical relations" with those persons who claim to have received ordination or consecration from the aforesaid person. In these circumstances your Committee have had to consider most carefully what should be the attitude of the Anglican Communion to those persons who claim to exercise priestly or episcopal functions with a succession derived from Bishop Mathew personally, or from those who claim to be his successors in the Episcopate; and on a review of all the facts they are driven to the conclusion that it is not possible to regard the so-called "Old Catholic Church in Great Britain," disclaimed as it is by the Old Catholics on the Continent, as a properly constituted branch of the Church, or to recognize the orders of its ministers. The circumstances of Bishop Mathew's consecration are so uncertain, and his subsequent isolation is so complete, that, without casting any sort of reflection on the validity of Old Catholic orders, or discussing the theological question of abstract "validity," we feel that as a matter of practice, in the event of any persons ordained by him or by his successors desiring to come over to the Anglican Church, and exercise their ministry in communion with it, the only proper course would be for them (if in all respects suitable) to be ordained *sub conditione*.* We recommend therefore that this course should be followed, and that, in order to make the position perfectly clear, the condition should be definitely stated in a document subscribed both by the Bishop ordaining and by the person to be ordained, and further that it should be expressed in the Letters of Orders, somewhat after the precedent set by Archbishop Bramhall in the case of some Presbyterians ordained by him in the Seventeenth century.†

* A Memorandum on "Conditional Ordination" was prepared by the Bishop of Gloucester for the use of the Conference, and will shortly be published.

† The following is the form used by Bramhall:—"Non annihilantes priores ordines (si quos habuit) nec invaliditatem eorundem determinantes, multo minus omnes ordines sacros ecclesiarum forinsecarum condemnantes, quos proprio Judici relinquimus, sed solummodo supplentes quicquid prius defuit per canones ecclesiæ Anglicanæ requisitum, et providentes paci ecclesiæ, ut schismatis tollatur occasio, et conscientiis fidelium satisfiat nec ulli dubitent de ejus ordinatione, aut actus suos presbyteriales tanquam invalidos aversentur."—Bramhall's *Works*, vol. i., p. 37.

A similar course we recommend to be followed in the case of persons ordained by Bishop Vernon Herford, "Bishop of Mercia" (who claims to have received consecration from "Mar Basilius, Metropolitan of India, &c."), or by other "episcopi vagantes," whose consecration and status we are unable to recognize. But before action is taken in this way by any individual Bishop we recommend that, after he has satisfied himself that the case is one in which it is desirable to proceed (a most necessary precaution), he should consult the Metropolitan of the Province, and place the case fully before him.

V.

THE *UNITAS FRATRUM* OR MORAVIANS.

The question of the position of the Moravians was first referred to in the Lambeth Conference so far back as 1878; but nothing of importance was done until in 1897 the Conference passed the two following resolutions:—"37. That this Conference, not possessing sufficient information to warrant the expression of a decided opinion upon the question of the orders of the *Unitas Fratrum* or Moravians, must content itself with expressing a hearty desire for such relations with them as will aid the cause of Christian Unity, and with recommending that there should be on the part of the Anglican Communion further consideration of the whole subject, in the hope of establishing closer relations between the *Unitas Fratrum* and the Churches represented in this Conference." "38. That the Archbishop of Canterbury be requested to appoint a Committee to conduct the further investigation of the subject, and for such purpose to confer with the authorities or representatives of the *Unitas Fratrum*." In accordance with this resolution a Committee was appointed in 1906 by the Archbishop of Canterbury which entered on a thorough investigation of the question of the succession of Moravian Bishops, the result of which was that in their opinion, though "a succession of regularly constituted ministers has beyond question been maintained in that community from the year 1467 to the present time," it is "a matter of grave doubt whether the ministry so maintained is in the strict sense an episcopal ministry." The Committee, which issued its Report in 1907, most regretfully arrived at this conclusion, *viz.* that "the way to immediate intercommunion with the Unity as a Sister Church seems to be at present barred by the great uncertainty of its possessing the historic Episcopate." This conclusion was received with great disappointment by the authorities of the Moravians, who, as was perhaps natural, could not agree with the verdict on the historical question, but frankly

recognized that any further negotiations on the part of the Anglican Church could only be carried on on the basis of that Report. They were, however, desirous that the next Lambeth Conference might take the matter up again, and asked that we should consider the possibility of such participation on our side in Moravian consecrations as would put Moravian orders for the future into a position satisfactory to Anglicans. Accordingly the matter came up again at the Conference of 1908; and the following resolutions were adopted:—

"70. For the sake of unity, and as a particular expression of brotherly affection, we recommend that any official request of the *Unitas Fratrum* for the participation of Anglican Bishops in the consecration of Bishops of the *Unitas* should be accepted, provided that

"(i) Such Anglican Bishops should be not less than three in number, and should participate both in the saying of the Prayers of Consecration and in the laying on of hands, and that the rite itself is judged to be sufficient by the Bishops of the Church of our Communion to which the invited Bishops belong;

"(ii) The Synods of the *Unitas* (*a*) are able to give sufficient assurance of doctrinal agreement with ourselves in all essentials (as we believe that they will be willing and able to do); and (*b*) are willing to explain its position as that of a religious community or missionary body in close alliance with the Anglican Communion; and (*c*) are willing to accord a due recognition to the position of our Bishops within Anglican Dioceses and jurisdictions; and (*d*) are willing to adopt a rule as to the administration of Confirmation more akin to our own.

"71. After the conditions prescribed in the preceding Resolution have been complied with, and a Bishop has been consecrated in accordance with them, corresponding invitations from any Bishop of the *Unitas Fratrum* to an Anglican Bishop and his Presbyters to participate in the Ordination of a Moravian Presbyter should be accepted, provided that the Anglican Bishop should participate both in the saying of the Prayers of Ordination and in the laying-on of hands, and that the rite itself is judged to be sufficient by the Bishops of the Church of our Communion to which the invited Bishop belongs.

"72. Any Bishop or Presbyter so consecrated or ordained should be free to minister in the Anglican Communion with due episcopal licence; and, in the event of the above proposals, *i.e.* Resolutions 1 and 2, being accepted and acted upon by the Synods of the *Unitas*, during the period of transition some permission to preach in our churches might on special occasions be extended to Moravian Ministers by Bishops of our Communion.

"73. We recommend that the Archbishop of Canterbury be respectfully requested to name a Committee to communicate,

as need arises, with representatives of the *Unitas*, and also to direct that the decisions of the present Conference be communicated to the *Secretarius Unitatis*."

This last resolution was promptly carried out. A Committee was appointed under the chairmanship of the Bishop of Durham (Dr. Moule) and negotiations were entered upon with the *Unitas*. The course of these negotiations and the explanations offered by the Moravians are fully described in the Report of the Committee which was prepared in 1913, and in which they state that the "conditions contained in Resolution 70 (i) and (ii) have now been satisfied." Since then, however, questions have arisen as to the completeness of the fulfilment of the conditions on the part of the *Unitas*, especially in regard to provisions (*b*) and (*c*), and even more in regard to (*d*), as it now appears that the *Unitas* permits deacons to celebrate Holy Communion, and also to administer Confirmation. This fact was unknown to the Committee when it made its report early in 1913. Since then the subject has been on two occasions brought before the Central Consultative Body of the Lambeth Conference (in July, 1913, and again in 1914), and that body came to the conclusion that it "did not feel itself justified in saying that in its judgement the conditions laid down in 70 (ii) of the Lambeth Conference have been so completely and satisfactorily met as to enable the participating action to be carried out," and it "recommended that the full Lambeth Conference at its next meeting should have an opportunity of expressing its opinion." From this time till now negotiations have been practically in abeyance, though quite recently informal communications have taken place between one or more members of the Committee and the Moravians. In these circumstances your Committee has had to consider the matter most carefully, and we have been greatly helped by a conference with Bishop Mumford, the President of the Provincial Board of the Moravian Church in Great Britain and Ireland. The time at our disposal has been too short for us to go into the questions at issue as fully as we would wish to have done. We are agreed, however, that condition (*a*) in 70 (ii) is satisfied; but there is still some uncertainty as to (*b*) and (*c*); and it is in our opinion impossible for any such action to take place as is contemplated in the resolution so long as the present practice of the Moravians in regard to the celebration of the Holy Communion and the administration of Confirmation by deacons remains unchanged. It might be possible, we think, for the fact of Confirmation by a Presbyter to be regarded as no bar to the measure of intercommunion proposed, provided that it were distinctly laid down that authority for such action on the part of Presbyters was directly delegated to them by the Bishop, there being precedents or this both in East and West. And if the *Unitas Fratrum*

can see its way to meet our requirements in these matters we think that negotiations with them might well be resumed, and we hope that the result would be that any remaining uncertainty as to 70 (ii) (*b*) and (*c*) would be removed. Should this happy consummation be arrived at we believe that they might then, through the Archbishop of Canterbury, invite Anglican Bishops to participate in a consecration without fear of refusal. The existing difficulties have already been brought before the authorities of the *Unitas*, and we are encouraged by statements made to us to hope that such a change of rule on its part is not out of the question. We therefore suggest that the Committee appointed after the last Lambeth Conference should be continued in existence, and strengthened by the addition of two members to supply the place of the late Bishop of Durham and Bishop Mitchinson ; and that this Committee should be ready, whenever the proper time comes, to re-enter upon negotiations with the *Unitas* ; and we further recommend that if the difficulties described above can be removed to the satisfaction of the Archbishop of Canterbury with the concurrence of the Consultative Body, there would then be no need to wait for another Lambeth Conference before action was taken. It should be added that in making these recommendations we have directly in view only the branch of the *Unitas Fratrum* in the British Isles. We are given to understand that as " a full Province " it has complete liberty to act by itself in this matter. But if the negotiations with the *Unitas* in the British Province can be carried to a successful issue, a valuable precedent will have been set, which may well be followed in other Provinces, and thus lead ultimately to complete intercommunion between the Anglican Communion and the *Unitas* in all parts of the world.

VI.

" The Reformed Episcopal Church."

This body has now about twenty-five congregations or churches in England served by thirty or forty ministers. It was introduced into this country from America, where it originated in 1866, and where there are still a certain number of its congregations. We are called on to consider it here because its " Southern Synod " has passed " by a large majority," and forwarded to the authorities of the English Church, the following resolution :—

" This Synod, being desirous, so far as in it lies, of maintaining unity among all Christian people, would be prepared to consider the question of the Union of the Reformed Episcopal Church with

the Established Church of England, provided that the ministers of the Reformed Episcopal Church are received as clergy duly ordained in accordance with the Articles of that Church, and that it is allowed to retain its Declaration of Principles unaltered with its Doctrine, Discipline, and Worship, as set forth in its Constitution, Canons, and Prayer Book."

Less formal proposals of a somewhat different character have also been received, suggesting that "the clergy should be re-ordained by the Anglican Bishops (or by one Bishop acting for the rest) and be permitted to minister to the congregations that they are at present serving, and that the congregations should be admitted to union with the Church of England under the provisions of an approved trust deed, which would secure the maintenance of the Evangelical character of their work."

Your Committee has had before it full particulars not only of the organization, worship, and principles of this body, but also of the origin of its ministry, and its claim to an Episcopal succession.* The members of the Committee find themselves quite unable to recommend the Conference to accept that claim. On this ground, therefore, they are compelled to recommend the Conference to decline to enter into negotiations with the Synod on the basis of the proposals made by it. With regard to the less formal proposal, they feel it necessary to point out that evidence has been before them that the standard of qualifications for the ministry in the Reformed Episcopal Church is such that it would not be easy for us to take any action with regard to the body corporately. Difficulties would arise in individual cases which in so small a body might assume serious proportions. There are also matters such as the nature of their trust deeds and the character of their Prayer Book, which might easily lead to complications. We think therefore that it is not desirable to enter into negotiations with the body as a whole. But, as the experience of the last few years has shewn that a tendency exists in both ministers and congregations of the Reformed Episcopal Church to apply for reunion with the Church of England, we recommend that such applications should be, wherever possible, sympathetically treated, and that if the minister satisfies our standards intellectually as well as in other ways, he should be ordained *sub conditione*; and that if the practical difficulties in the way of

* The origin of the Reformed Episcopal Church is explained in "A Statement in regard to Ordinations or Consecrations performed by Dr. Cummins, or others claiming Ordination or Consecration from him, prepared by the Presiding Bishop of the American Church, the Right Rev. John Williams, D.D.,LL.D.," which was submitted to the Lambeth Conference of 1888. The chief facts stated in this document are apparently not denied, though the conclusions drawn from them are traversed in *The Origin, Orders, Organisation, and Worship of the Reformed Episcopal Church in the United Kingdom*, by Philip X. Eldridge, D.D., Presiding Bishop (1910).

congregations joining us can be overcome they should be received on the condition that as loyal English Church people they accept the Book of Common Prayer in place of the book now in use in the Reformed Episcopal Church.

Part IV.

Conclusion.

It is impossible for those who have worked point by point over the difficult ground covered by this Report to judge what impression it will make upon those who come to it freshly and as a whole. Some will probably find in it at some points laxity in the enforcement of principle: others may charge it with rigidity.

To some it will seem to move too rashly: others will complain that it moves so little. Yet most earnestly do we hope that there may be real value found in what has been arrived at with so large a measure of unity, and with a sense of constraint towards agreement which surprised ourselves, and seemed, as we reverently believe, to be of the Spirit's guidance.

The wounds of the Church of Christ are very deep and very stiff with time and controversy.

They cannot be quickly healed. Rather will they have to be first more deeply probed, and the measure of the contrast between men's doings and God's purpose more fully understood. Certainly the sense of being drawn together and drawn upward was never so strong or so uplifting as when we were moved to look beyond smaller ideals and limited agreements to the vision of the One Holy Catholic Church of the Divine Redeemer, into which all the divided groups of His faithful people must bring what they have of glory and honour, and which cannot be made perfect till all its parts are drawn together in Him. If there is any value in this Report it comes from the inspiration of that only true and divine ideal.

(Signed) COSMO EBOR:
Chairman.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY THE CORNWALL PRESS, LTD.,
PARIS GARDEN, STAMFORD STREET, LONDON, S.E. 1.

INDEX

N.B.—In the following index, the letters (*a*), (*b*), (*c*), (*d*), (*e*), (*f*), prefixed to the page-reference, indicate that the passage referred to will be found in the official documents of the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, or sixth Conference respectively. The page numbers following (*f*) refer to the Appendix, *i.e.* the 1920 Conference. Where (*N*) is prefixed, the reference is to the Narrative in Part I of the volume.

A

Abyssinians, (*f*) 151
Adaptation of Services. *See* "Prayer Book"
Addington, (*N*) 15
Additional Curates Society, (*e*) 359
Africa, Missionary work in, (*b*) 85; (*d*) 223, 226; (*e*) 373, 374
— Native churches in, (*d*) 232–234; (*e*) 375, 377; (*f*) 137, 140. *See also* "Uganda"
After-care Committees, (*f*) 76
American Church, The, (*N*) 15, 21, 46*a*, 46*g*; (*a*) 62, 64, 76, 77; (*b*) 90, 91, 95, 96, 97; (*c*) 122, 145, 146, 150, 152, 157–158, 160; (*d*) 205, 209, 223, 234, 237, 241–242, 245, 251, 253; (*e*) 349, 352, 361, 369, 377, 403, 416, 418; (*f*) 37, 54, 139, 140
— — Invitation to Convention of, (*a*) 77
Anglican Communion, Churches of the, (*b*) 98
— — Discipline of the, (*N*) 16; (*a*) 54, 63
— — Distinctive position of the, (*N*) 9; (*a*) 50, 53, 55–56; (*b*) 83, 94; (*c*) 153–155
— — Extension of the, (*f*) 137
— — Organisation of the, (*b*) 84; (*d*) 187, 200, 212–214; (*e*) 312, 415–419; (*f*) 13. *See also* "Standards," "Declaration"
— Orders, Validity of, (*c*) 150
Anointing of the Sick. *See* "Sick, Anointing of the"
Aphthartodocetic heresy, (*e*) 425
Apostles' Creed, (*c*) 122, 159, 171; (*d*) 248; (*e*) 387; (*f*) 28
Appeal, A central Court of, (*N*) 10; (*a*) 56, 62–65; (*b*) 87–89; (*c*) 113, 151; (*d*) 187, 199, 214; (*e*) 418. *See also* "Consultative Body, Central"
"Appeal to all Christian People." *See under* "Lambeth Conference of 1920"
Arabia, Pioneer work in, (*d*) 230
Arbitration (Ecclesiastical), Boards of, (*b*) 87–89.
— Industrial, (*c*) 140
— International, (*d*) 186, 207, 258–264; (*e*) 312, 329
— List of works bearing on, (*d*) 263. *See also* "Appeal"
Archbishop's Licence, (*e*) 364
Archbishop, Title of, (*c*) 150; (*d*) 176, 187, 200
Armagh, Archbishop D'Arcy of, (*N*) 46*m*
Armenian Church, The, (*b*) 93; (*c*) 169; (*e*) 424; (*f*) 32, 149, 151
Articles, The Thirty-Nine, (*b*) 100; (*c*) 117, 124, 154, 173–174
Asiatic Women, (*f*) 113
Assessors in Court of Appeal, (*a*) 65; (*b*) 88–89; (*c*) 151
Assyrian Christians, (*f*) 32
— Mission, The, (*c*) 170
Athanasian Creed. *See* "*Quicunque vult*"
Augustana Synod, (*d*) 253
Australia and Tasmania, Synod of, (*c*) 150, 151, 157; (*d*) 273, 284; (*e*) 416; (*f*) 140
Austria, Old Catholics in, (*c*) 123, 164; (*d*) 194, 204, 242;

(*e*) 334, 427; (*f*) 152. *See also* "Old Catholics"
Authoritative Standards. *See* "Standards"
Autonomy of Churches, (*d*) 197, 202, 204, 233, 237; (*e*) 321, 373, 377, 419. *See also* "Native Churches"

B

Bands of Hope, (*c*) 126. *See also* "Temperance"
Baptism, conditional, (*f*) 91
— Infant, (*d*) 190, 208
— of illegitimates, (*f*) 90
— of members of Eastern Church, (*e*) 332, 424
— of polygamists, (*c*) 134; (*e*) 374
— Sacrament of, (*f*) 28
Barrett, Sir W., (*f*) 118
Bell, Rev. G. K. A., (*N*) 46*b*
Benson, Archbishop, (*N*) 27, 28, 31, 33, 37, 40, 46*c*, 46*e*; (*d*) 284
Bible, Critical study of the, (*a*) 50; (*b*) 94; (*c*) 111; (*d*) 188, 191, 201, 218–221; (*e*) 354; (*f*) 43
— teaching, (*c*) 111; (*e*) 305, 320, 368, 370. *See also* "Lectionary"
"Bidding to Prayer" services, (*e*) 385
Birth Control, (*f*) 44–45, 107, 112
Bishops and oath of obedience. *See* "Obedience"
— Appointment of new. *See* "Sees, establishment of new"
— attending Conferences. *See* "Lambeth Conferences, numbers attending"
— Jurisdiction of, (*a*) 57, 70, 71; (*b*) 84, 90–92; (*c*) 112, 149; (*d*) 197, 203, 207, 236; (*e*) 322, 379, 419; (*f*) 79
— Notification of Consecration of, (*a*) 54, 71; (*b*) 91
— Scheme for conducting the election of, (*a*) 56, 67
— Tribunal for the trial of, (*a*) 66; (*b*) 88–89
Bloemfontein, Diocese of, (*d*) 284
Boards of Missions, (*N*) 42; (*b*) 97; (*d*) 201, 278; (*e*) 360, 378; (*f*) 85
Board of Reference for Foreign Missions. *See* "Missions"
Board of Women's Work, (*f*) 106
Bonn, Conferences at, (*c*) 167, 172; (*d*) 205
Books on International Arbitration, (*d*) 263
Booth, Sir Charles, (*f*) 73
Bramhall, Archbishop, (*f*) 155
Brazil, Reformation Movement in, (*d*) 194, 205, 242
Brightman, Rev. Dr. F. E., (*f*) 94
British and Foreign Bible Society, (*N*) 46*k*
British Association, (*f*) 118
Brotherhood of man, (*d*) 184, 263, 266, 270; (*e*) 327, 410; (*f*) 46, 73.
— The principle of, (*d*) 266, 411; (*f*) 69. *See also* "Fellowship"
Brotherhoods and Sisterhoods. *See* "Communities"
Brunel, Dr. Isambard, (*N*) 13, 23; (*a*) 77
Buckingham Palace Garden Party, (*N*) 46*k*
Buddhism, Exaggerated opinion of excellences of (*d*) 201, 224
— Purified, (*d*) 225

C

Cairns, Lord, member of Council of Reference, (*c*) 151
Calcutta, Bishop Johnson of, (*b*) 91
Caldwell, Bishop, (*b*) 91
Callinicos, Archpriest, (*f*) 147
Canada, Dominion of, (*f*) 66
Canadian Church, The, (*N*) 3, 5, 14, 15; (*c*) 157; (*e*) 404; (*f*) 75, 140
— — Synod of, (*d*) 283; (*e*) 363, 416
Canonical obedience, Oath of, (*b*) 101; (*d*) 187, 200; (*e*) 419; (*f*) 38, 79
Canterbury Cathedral, Services in, (*N*) 19, 20, 30, 41, 43, 46*c*; (*e*) 294
Canterbury (See of) and Colonial Bishops. *See* "Obedience"
Cape Palmas, Church in, (*d*) 234
Central Board of Missions, (*f*) 83, 84
Central Consultative Body. *See* "Consultative Body, Central"
Chalcedon, Council of, (*e*) 425; (*f*) 150, 151
Chaplains, Continental, (*N*) 22; (*a*) 57, 71; (*b*) 92–93
— Relations of, to other Churches, (*e*) 333

INDEX

Chaplains to Archbishop Tait, (*N*) 22
Chelmsford, Lord, member of Council of Reference, (*c*) 151
Chesterton, Mr. G. K., (*f*) 74
China and opium, (*e*) 328; (*f*) 26, 55, 93
— Missionary work in, (*d*) 223, 233, 235, 236; (*e*) 377; (*f*) 83
— National Church in, (*d*) 236; (*e*) 377; (*f*) 79, 83, 137, 140
Christ as centre of Church's teaching, (*c*) 112; (*e*) 296
Christendom, Unity of. *See* "Unity"
Christian Science, (*e*) 392; (*f*) 15, 41–42, 116–118, 122–125
Christian Social Crusade, (*f*) 76
Christian Social Union, (*e*) 299, 415; (*f*) 75
— Unity Association, (*e*) 433
Christianity and International Relations. *See* "International Relations"
"Christianity and Industrial Problems," Archbishops' Committee on, (*f*) 67, 72
Christological dissensions, (*f*) 149
Chung-hua Sheng Kung Hui, (*f*) 83
Church and industrial problems, (*d*) 207, 265–271; (*f*) 45–47, 59–77
— and missionary societies, (*d*) 238
— and "Social Service" Committee, (*f*) 76
Church Army, (*f*) 76
— finance, (*e*) 360, 412
— history, Teaching of, (*d*) 191, 211
— House, The, (*N*) 36, 44, 46*k*
— information, Circulation of, (*b*) 85
Church Missionary Society, (*N*) 46*k*; (*d*) 277; (*e*) 360
— Moral witness of the, (*e*) 311, 327–329, 409–415
— of England Men's Society, (*e*) 298
"Church of Sweden and the Anglican Communion," (*f*) 152, 153
— Office of the, (*e*) 296
— Secondary Schools, (*e*) 305, 321, 369
— Unity. *See* "Unity, Church"
Churches, Independent, Co-operation with, (*b*) 85
— — Rights of, (*b*) 84, 90; (*d*) 203; (*e*) 321, 322, 379
— united to Church of England, (*b*) 83, 98
Civil Courts, Appeal to, by Bishops, (*a*) 67
Clement VII, Pope, (*d*) 257
Clergy Pensions Institution, (*e*) 360, 361
— Pensions for, (*e*) 303, 319, 357, 360, 412
Clergy, Supply and training of, (*d*) 278; (*e*) 303, 318–320, 347–367; (*f*) 75, 84, 125
— Training of, in U.S.A., (*e*) 355
— younger, Service abroad of, (*d*) 192, 208, 278, 281; (*e*) 304, 319, 356–358; (*f*) 84
Cleveland Coxe, Bishop, (*N*) 20, 33
Colenso, Bishop, (*N*) 7, 10, 11, 12; (*a*) 55, 73–74, 76
Colonial and Continental Church Society, (*N*) 46*k*; (*d*) 277
— Bishoprics' Fund, (*N*) 12; (*a*) 73, 76; (*d*) 277
— Churches and Mother Church, (*N*) 5, 16; (*a*) 56, 63, 64; (*c*) 113, 152; (*d*) 192, 209, 214, 276–282
— Clergy Act, (*b*) 99–100; (*d*) 281; (*e*) 356, 363–367
— — Work at home for, (*c*) 113, 152; (*d*) 282; (*e*) 356–357, 364
Colonies, Duties of Church to the, (*d*) 191, 192, 209, 276–282
— Extension of Episcopate in, (*d*) 279; (*f*) 79
— Supply of Clergy for the. *See* "Clergy younger, Service abroad of"
Colour Problems, (*f*) 26, 63
Commendatory Letters. *See* "Letters Commendatory"
Committees, Reports of, 1867, (*a*):
Condition of the Church in Natal, (*a*) 73
Courts of Metropolitans, (*a*) 66
Declaration of submission to Synods, (*a*) 68
Election of Bishops, (*a*) 67
Letters Dimissory, (*a*) 75
Missionary Bishoprics, (*a*) 71
Provincial Subordination, (*a*) 70
Synodical system, (*a*) 58
Voluntary Spiritual Tribunals, (*a*) 62

1878, (*b*):

Anglican Chaplains on the Continent, (*b*) 92

Committees, Reports of—*contd.*
Answers to questions submitted during the Conference, (*b*) 93
Best mode of maintaining union, (*b*) 82
Missionary Bishops and Missionaries, (*b*) 89
Voluntary Boards of Arbitration, (*b*) 87

1888, (*c*):

Authoritative Standards of Doctrine and Worship, (*c*) 170
Care of Emigrants, (*c*) 141
Divorce, (*c*) 132
Eastern Churches, (*c*) 167
Home Reunion, (*c*) 156
Intemperance, (*c*) 125
Mutual Relations of Dioceses and Branches of the Anglican Communion, (*c*) 149
Observance of Sunday, (*c*) 135
Polygamy, (*c*) 133
Purity, (*c*) 130
Scandinavian Church, Old Catholics, etc., (*c*) 161
Socialism, (*c*) 136

1897, (*d*)

Book of Common Prayer, (*d*) 271
Church Unity, (*d*) 243
Critical Study of Holy Scripture, (*d*) 218
Degrees in Divinity, (*d*) 283
Duties of the Church to the Colonies, (*d*) 276
Foreign Missions, (*d*) 222
Industrial Problems, (*d*) 265
International Arbitration, (*d*) 258
Organisation of the Anglican Communion, (*d*) 212
Reformation Movements on the Continent, (*d*) 240
Religious Communities, (*d*) 215

1908 (*e*):

Administration of Holy Communion, (*e*) 388
Book of Common Prayer, (*e*) 382
Faith and Modern Thought, (*e*) 338
Foreign Missions, (*e*) 372
Marriage Problems, (*e*) 395
Ministries of Healing, (*e*) 390
Moral Witness of the Church, (*e*) 409
Organisation in the Anglican Communion, (*e*) 415
Religious Communities (Report presented to Conference of 1908), (*e*) 440
Religious Education, (*e*) 367
Reunion and Intercommunion, (*e*) 420
Supply and Training of Clergy, (*e*) 347

1920 (*f*):

Christianity and International Relations, (*f*) 51.
Church and Industrial Problems, (*f*) 59
Development of Provinces, (*f*) 78
Missionary Problems, (*f*) 81
Position of Women, (*f*) 95
Problems of Marriage, (*f*) 107
Reunion, (*f*) 132
Spiritualism, Christian Science and Theosophy, (*f*) 116
Common Cup. *See* "Holy Communion"
Communion to the Sick, Administration of. *See* "Holy Communion"
Communities, Religious, (*d*) 188, 201, 215–218; (*e*) 298, 440–446; (*f*) 98
— — Relations of, to the Episcopate, (*e*) 315, 331, 442–446; (*f*) 98
Community Missions, (*d*) 224, 226
Conditional Ordination, (*f*) 155
Conference of Missionary Societies, (*f*) 94
Conferences for Reunion, (*e*) 337; (*f*) 136
Confession, The practice of, (*b*) 94, 97
Confirmation and admission to Holy Communion, (*f*) 31, 142
— and baptismal promises, (*d*) 190, 208
— in Swedish Church, (*f*) 153
Constantinople, Patriarchs of, (*c*) 124
— Work in, (*d*) 230; (*f*) 148
Consultative Body, Central, (*N*) 46*b*; (*d*) 187, 199, 214; (*e*) 313, 330, 416–418; (*f*) 13, 34, 38–39, 80, 158. *See also* "Appeal"

INDEX

Continent, Reformation Movements on the. *See* "Reformation Movements"
Convocation of Canterbury, (*N*) 4, 5, 11, 14, 15, 37; (*a*) 55; (*c*) 156, 160; (*e*) 413; (*f*) 139
Convocation of York, (*N*) 17, 37; (*c*) 157; (*f*) 139
Co-operation between Churches, (*b*) 85
Copleston, Bishop, (*N*) 44
Coptic Church, (*c*) 169; (*e*) 425; (*f*) 151
Cotterill, Bishop, (*N*) 12, 13, 23; (*a*) 76
Council of Reference, A, (*c*) 113, 151. *See also* "Appeal"
Country parishes, (*e*) 357
Court of Appeal, A Central. *See* "Appeal"
Creeds. *See* "Standards," "*Quicunque vult*," "Apostles' Creed," "Nicene Creed"
Creighton, Bishop, (*d*) 244
Cummins, Dr., (*f*) 160
Czecho-Slovakia, Church in, (*f*) 154

D

Danish Church. *See* "Scandinavian Church"
Davidson, Archbishop, (*N*) 22, 23, 28, 35, 43, 46*a*, 46*c*, 46*l*, 46*m*, 46*n*; (*e*) 440
Davidson, Mrs. Randall, (*N*) 46*l*, 46*m*
Deaconesses, (*d*) 201, 215–218; (*e*) 298, 440–446; (*f*) 14, 40, 101–105
— duties of, (*f*) 104. *See also* "Communities, Religious"
Declaration, A, of Anglican Doctrine, (*N*) 16; (*c*) 122, 153–155, 160, 169, 174; (*d*) 245; (*e*) 425; (*f*) 28
Definite teaching of the Faith, (*c*) 110–112; (*f*) 42, 43
Degrees in Divinity, (*d*) 210, 283–286
Democratic movement, (*e*) 311, 327, 409–415. *See also* "Socialism"
Demotica, Metropolitan of, (*f*) 32, 147
Denmark, Primate of, (*e*) 431. *See also* "Scandinavian Church"
Departed, Prayers for the, (*e*) 384
De Tocqueville on Democracy, (*e*) 409
Development of Provinces. *See* "Provinces, Formation of"
Diaconate, Age for, (*e*) 352
— Length of, (*b*) 96; (*e*) 354
— restoration of, in Swedish Church, (*f*) 153
Dimissory Letters, (*a*) 75, 77. *See also* "Letters Commendatory"
Diocesan Synods. *See* "Synods"
Dioceses. *See* "Bishops," "Sees," "Mutual Relations"
Discipline of the Anglican Communion. *See* "Anglican Communion"
Diversities in Worship, (*b*) 86–87. *See also* "Ritual" "Standards"
Divorce, (*c*) 108, 119, 120, 132–133; (*e*) 309, 326, 396–397, 402–405; (*f*) 44, 108, 111. *See also* "Marriage"
Doctrine, Anglican. *See* "Anglican Communion," "Declaration," "Standards"
— of other Churches, Study of, (*c*) 122, 160, 166; (*d*) 196, 206, 245; (*e*) 336, 425, 433
Dornakal, Diocese of, (*f*) 83
Dover, Bishop Bilbrough of, (*N*) 46*i*
Drink, Intoxicating. *See* "Temperance"
Drink Traffic. *See* "Native Races and demoralising influences"
Durham, Bishop Moule of, (*f*) 158, 159

E

East Africa, Alliance of Missionary Societies in, (*f*) 140
Eastern Churches Committee, (*f*) 32, 148, 151
Eastern Churches, Relations with, (*c*) 115–116, 124, 167–170; (*d*) 205, 244; (*e*) 315, 316, 332–333, 422–425; (*f*) 32–33, 145–151. *See also* "Unity, Church"
East Syrian Church, (*e*) 425; (*f*) 149–151
Ebbs Fleet, Visit of Bishops to, (*N*) 40
Ecclesiastical Information, Circulation of, (*b*) 85
Economics, (*f*) 68
Education as a Missionary agency, (*d*) 226
— Religious, (*c*) 110, 111; (*e*) 304, 320, 367–372; (*f*) 69

INDEX

Egypt, Educational work in, (*d*) 230
Elizabeth, Queen, Special services in reign of, (*d*) 274
Ellicott, Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol (*N*) 8, 13, 23, 28, 35
Ely, Committees held at, (*N*) 36
Emigration, (*c*) 110, 121, 141–148; (*d*) 192, 209, 210, 280
Encyclical Letters, (*N*) 11, 13, 24, 37, 38, 42, 44, 46*l*, 46*n*; (*a*) 49, 54; (*b*) 82; (*c*) 106; (*d*) 182; (*e*) 294; (*f*) 9
English-Speaking Union, (*N*) 46*k*
Episcopal Churches, Reunion with, (*f*) 32–34, 144–161. *See also* "Unity, Church"
— Ordination, (*f*) 28–29, 34, 143
Episcopate as instrument of unity, (*f*) 28
— Extension of, in Colonies, (*d*) 279; (*f*) 79
— Relation of Religious Communities to. *See* "Communities"
Ethnic Religions, (*d*) 224
Europe, suffering in, (*f*) 26
Eutychianism, (*f*) 151
Exchange of Pulpits (*f*) 30, 33, 141, 142

F

Faith and Modern Thought, (*e*) 301, 318, 338–347
— and Order, World Conference on, (*f*) 11, 32, 139
— Definite teaching of the, (*c*) 110–112; (*f*) 42, 43
— Healing. *See* "Ministries of Healing"
Family Life, (*f*) 18, 108
Farnham, Committees held at, (*N*) 24, 36
Fellowship of the Church, (*f*) 9, 10, 13–17, 27, 31, 47
Fiji, Missionary work in, (*d*) 235
Filioque Clause, The, (*c*) 172; (*f*) 148
Finland. *See* "Scandinavian Church"
Flexner, Mr. Abraham, (*f*) 112
Foreign Missions. *See* "Missions, foreign"
Foreign Missions Conference of North America, (*f*) 94
Forrester, Rev. H., (*d*) 241
France, Reformation Movement in, (*c*) 123, 165; (*d*) 194, 205, 242. *See also* "Reformation Movements"
Frankfort, Council of, (*c*) 168
Frere, Rev. Dr. W. H., (*f*) 94
Fulford, Bishop, (*N*) 12
Fulham, Committees held at (*N*) 24, 44
— Parish Church, (*N*) 44, 46*c*

G

Gallican Clergy, (*c*) 165; (*f*) 144
Gambling, (*e*) 312; (*f*) 65
Geneva, Conference at, (*f*) 57
Germany, (*f*) 25, 55, 60
— Old Catholics in, (*c*) 123, 163–164; (*d*) 194, 204, 240; (*e*) 334, 427. *See also* "Old Catholics"
Gibraltar, Bishop Knight of, (*f*) 147
Girls' Friendly Society, (*c*) 145
Glastonbury Abbey, Visit of Bishops to, (*N*) 42
Gloucester and Bristol, Bishop Ellicott of, (*N*) 8, 13, 23, 28, 35
Gnostics, (*f*) 118
Gore, Bishop, (*N*) 46*c*
Grahamstown, Bishop Cotterill of, (*N*) 12, 13, 23; (*a*) 76
Greek Church, The (*e*) 422, 423; (*f*) 146
— Versions of Encyclical Letters. *See* "Versions"
Gregory, Pope, (*N*) 21, 32
Grotius, Hugo, (*f*) 54
"Guardian, The," (*N*) 23
Guilds of Social Service. *See* "Social Service"
Gurney and Sons, (*N*) 46*l*
Gustavus Vasa, King, (*d*) 255, 257

H

Hague, The, Conferences at, (*e*) 312, 329; (*f*) 54
Haiti, Anglican Church of, (*b*) 93, 96, 99
Halki, Church of Constantinople in, (*e*) 422
Harrisburg, Bishop of, (*f*) 147
Hassé, Bishop, (*e*) 428. *See also* "Moravian Church"
Hatherley, Lord, member of Council of Reference, (*c*) 151
Hatred, dangers of, (*f*) 54
Headlam, Dr., (*f*) 71
Hebrew, Knowledge of, (*e*) 362
Heresies, (*e*) 425; (*f*) 150–151
Herford, Bishop Vernon, (*f*) 156
Herrnhut, Moravian Synod at, (*e*) 428

Herzog, Bishop, (*d*) 241
Hichens, Mr. W. L., (*f*) 63, 70
Hinduism, Exaggerated opinion of excellences, of, (*d*) 201
— Purified, (*d*) 225
Historical Readers. *See* "Church History"
Holland, Old Catholics of, (*c*) 123, 162–164; (*e*) 334, 427. *See also* "Old Catholics"
Holy Communion, Administration of, (*c*) 107; (*e*) 307, 324, 385, 388–390; (*f*) 142
— — Administration of, to non-episcopal congregations, (*f*) 30, 141, 142
— — Administration of, to the sick, (*d*) 190, 208
— Orders, Candidates for. *See* "Clergy"
— Scripture. *See* "Bible"
Home Reunion. *See* "Unity, Church"
Homilies, Book of, (*c*) 154
Hooker, Richard, on Law, (*e*) 300
Hoover, Mr., (*f*) 68
Housing problem, (*f*) 73

I

Icons, Use of, (*c*) 168, 172
Illinois, Bishop Whitehouse of, (*N*) 68; (*a*) 77
Immigrant Chaplains, (*c*) 145–147. *See also* "Emigrants"
Impurity. *See* "Purity"
India, Bishop Copleston, Metropolitan of, (*N*) 44
— Bishop F. Westcott, Metropolitan of, (*N*) 46*m*
— Missionary work in, (*d*) 223, 224, 230; (*e*) 377
— Native Churches in, (*d*) 233; (*e*) 377; (*f*) 137, 140
— Subordinate Bishops in, (*b*) 92
Indian Institute at Oxford, (*d*) 232
Indians, North American, (*d*) 232
Industrial Christian Fellowship, (*f*) 75
— co-operation, (*c*) 138–141; (*d*) 270; (*f*) 18, 46, 60
— missions, (*d*) 224
— problems, (*d*) 184, 207, 265–271; (*e*) 409–415; (*f*) 45–47, 59–77
Infidelity, Modern forms of, (*N*), 18, 24
Information, Ecclesiastical, Circulation of, (*b*) 85
Institute for International Affairs, (*f*) 57
Intemperance. *See* "Temperance"
Intercession, Day of, (*b*) 86; (*d*) 223, 229
— for Church Unity, (*d*) 193, 205
Intercommunion. *See* "Letters Commendatory," "Unity, Church"
Interdependence of Nations, (*d*) 258
International Arbitration. *See* "Arbitration"
— Chamber of Commerce, (*f*) 57
— Congress in Vienna, (*d*) 205
— Friendship, World Alliance for Promoting, (*f*) 57
— Labour Conference, (*f*) 57, 64
— Missionary Conference, (*f*) 94
— Relations, (*f*) 19–20, 25–26, 51–58, 92–93. *See also* "Arbitration, International"
Investments, Moral responsibility in, (*e*) 328
Invitation to Conferences, (*N*) 5, 18, 27, 40, 43, 46*b*
Irish Prayer Book, (*e*) 383, 384
Islam. *See* "Mohammedanism"
Isolation of Missionaries, Dangers of, (*d*) 226
Italy, Reformation Movement in, (*c*) 123, 165; (*d*) 194, 205, 242. *See also* "Reformation Movements"

J

Japan and morphia traffic, (*f*) 55
— Child labour in, (*f*) 57
— Missionary work in, (*d*) 223, 233; (*e*) 377
— Native Churches in, (*d*) 235; (*e*) 416; (*f*) 79, 83, 137
Jerusalem, Anglican Bishopric in, (*c*) 167; (*d*) 244; (*e*) 422
Jews, The, conversion of, (*d*) 195, 201, 223, 227–229
Johnson, Bishop, of Calcutta, (*b*) 91
Jurisdiction of Bishops. *See* "Bishops"
Jus liturgicum, (*d*) 272, 273
Justice, The principle of, (*d*) 267

K

Kaffraria, Missionary work in, (*b*) 85
Kalmar, Bishop of, (*e*) 315, 335, 429, 430
Karlsruhe, Synod at, (*d*) 241

Kelham, House of the Sacred Mission, (*e*) 350
Kerfoot, Bishop, (*N*) 15
King, Bishop, of Lincoln, (*N*) 40
King, H.M. the, Reception of Bishops by, (*N*) 44; 46*k*
King's College Hostel, (*N*) 46*b*
Kirkup, T., Definition of Socialism by, (*c*) 137
Komninos, Professor, (*f*) 147
Krishnamurti, (*f*) 129

L

Labour Bureaux, (*d*) 269
— Movement, (*f*) 62–64, 76
— The principle of, (*d*) 266; (*f*) 46
Laity, Work of the, (*e*) 303, 327; (*f*) 76, 106, 115
Lambeth Conferences, Advantages of, (*N*) 5, 6, 15, 16, 34, 39; (*b*) 83; (*c*) 117; (*d*) 187, 198, 199, 213
— — Arrangements for hospitality, (*N*) 26, 38, 46*b*, 46*o*
— — Conditions of membership, (*N*) 27, 43, 46*b*; (*b*) 82; (*c*) 106; (*d*) 182, 199; (*e*) 294
— — Expenses of, (*N*) 25
— — Numbers attending, (*N*) 13, 19, 25, 30, 38, 42, 45, 46*o*
— — Objects, position and limits of, (*N*) 4, 5, 6, 8, 15–17; (*a*) 61–62; (*b*) 83; (*c*) 107; (*d*) 213, 285; (*e*) 315, 377; (*f*) 14
— — Periodical summoning of, (*N*) 14, 27, 46*a*; (*a*) 62; (*d*) 199
— — Petitions to, (*N*) 23, 36
— — Records of, (*N*) 23, 35, 46*l*; (*a*) 76
— — Resolutions of, (*N*) 12, 19, 36, 42, 45, 46*l*; (*e*) 295, 314; (*f*) 25
— — Results of, (*N*) 25, 38; (*b*) 97–98; (*e*) 295, 316
— — Secretaries of, (*N*) 8, 12, 13, 23, 28, 35, 38, 46*b*; (*a*) 76
— — Selection of subjects of discussion, (*N*) 6, 16, 18, 28, 46*a*, 46*b*; (*b*) 84
Lambeth Conference of 1867, (*a*)
— — Agenda for, (*N*) 7
— — Encyclical Letter of, (*N*) 11; (*a*) 49
— — Invitation to, (*N*) 5
— — Number of Bishops attending, (*N*) 7, 13
— — Origin of, (*N*) 3
Lambeth Conference of 1867—*contd.*
— — Proceedings of (*N*), 8–12
— — Refusals from Bishops, (*N*) 7
— — Reports of Committees of, (*a*) 58–75
— — Resolutions of, (*N*) 11, 12; (*a*) 53, 76
— — Sermons at, (*N*) 8, 11
Lambeth Conference of 1878, (*b*)
— — Agenda for, (*N*) 18, 22
— — Encyclical Letter of, with Reports, (*N*) 24; (*b*) 82–101
— — Invitation to (*N*) 18
— — List of Bishops attending, (*b*) 79
— — Number of Bishops attending, (*N*) 19, 25
— — Origin of, (*N*) 14–17
— — Proceedings of, (*N*) 19–25
— — Sermons at, (*N*) 20, 22, 25
Lambeth Conference of 1888, (*c*)
— — Address to the Queen, (*N*) 37
— — Agenda for, (*N*) 29
— — Encyclical Letter of, (*N*) 37, 38; (*c*) 106
— — Invitation to, (*N*) 27
— — List of Bishops attending, (*c*) 102
— — Number of Bishops attending, (*N*) 30, 38
— — Origin of, (*N*) 27
— — Proceedings of, (*N*) 30–38
— — Reports of Committees of, (*N*) 36; (*c*) 125–175
— — Resolutions of, (*N*) 36; (*c*) 119
— — Sermons at, (*N*) 31, 33, 34, 37, 38
Lambeth Conference of 1897, (*d*)
— — Agenda for, (*N*) 41
— — Devotional Day, (*N*) 40
— — Encyclical Letter of, (*N*) 42; (*d*) 182
— — Invitation to, (*N*) 40
— — List of Bishops attending, (*d*) 176
— — Number of Bishops attending, (*N*) 40, 42
— — Reception by the Queen, (*N*) 41
— — Reports of Committees of, (*N*) 42; (*d*) 212–286
— — Resolutions of, (*d*) 199
— — Responsibility of, (*d*) 183
— — Sermons at, (*N*) 40, 42
Lambeth Conference of 1908, (*e*)
— — Address to the King, (*N*) 44
— — Agenda for, (*N*) 44
— — Devotional Day, (*N*) 44

Lambeth Conference of 1908—*contd.*
— — Encyclical Letter of, (*N*) 44; (*e*) 294
— — Invitation to, (*N*) 43
— — List of Bishops attending, (*e*) 287
— — Number of Bishops attending. (*N*) 45
— — Reports of Committees of, (*e*) 338–446
—— Resolutions of, (*e*) 318
— — Sermons at, (*N*) 43, 44, 45
Lambeth Conference of 1920, (*f*)
— — Address to the King, (*N*) 46*k*
— — Agenda for, (*N*) 46*b*, 46*j*
— — "Appeal to all Christian People," (*N*) 46*n*; (*f*) 12, 26–29, 133–136, 139
— — Chairs used at, (*N*) 46*o*
— — Devotional Day, (*N*) 46*b*, 46*c*
— — Encyclical Letter of, (*N*) 46*l*, 46*n*, (*f*) 9
— — Hospitality Committee, (*N*) 46*b*, 46*o*
— — Intercessions for, (*N*) 46*i*, 46*j*
— — Invitation to, (*N*) 46*a*, 46*b*
— — List of Bishops attending, (*f*) *v*, 1
— — "Message to Men and Women of Goodwill," (*N*) 46*n*
— — Method of work of, (*f*) 22–23
— — Number of Bishops attending, (*N*) 46*b*, 46*o*
— — Press arrangements for, (*N*) 46*n*
— — Questionnaires and papers prepared for, (*N*) 46*k*
— — Reports of Committees of, (*f*) 23, 51–161
— — Resolutions of, (*N*) 46*l*; (*f*) 23, 25–47, 141
— — Retired Bishops invited to, (*N*) 46*b*
— — Sermons at, (*N*) 46*c*, 46*g*, 46*m*
— — Summary of Report of, (*N*) 46*n*
Lambeth Palace Chapel, (*N*) 8, 21, 33, 35, 46*i*; (*b*) 82; (*c*) 106
— — Crypt, (*N*) 46*i*
— — Guard-Room, (*N*) 8, 21, 41, 44, 46*i*
— — Library, (*N*) 22, 35, 44, 46*i*
Lambeth Parish Church, (*N*) 11
Latin Communion, (*c*) 115; (*d*) 246; (*e*) 426. *See also* "Rome"
Latin, Knowledge of (*e*) 355, 362
— Versions of Encyclical Letters. *See* "Versions"
Laveleye, Definition of Socialism by, (*c*) 136
Laying-on of Hands, (*e*) 394; (*f*) 43, 153, 157
Lay Readers, (*f*) 105–106
League of Nations, (*f*) 19–20, 25–26, 47, 51–58, 60, 64, 66, 94
— — — Union, (*f*) 25, 57
Lectionary, (*e*) 386
Leo XIII, Pope, (*d*) 246
Letters Commendatory, (*a*) 54, 72, 75, 77; (*b*) 84, 85; (*c*) 113, 145, 146, 148; (*d*) 192, 197, 203, 210, 280; (*e*) 320, 356
Letters Encyclical. *See* "Encyclical"
— Testimonial. *See* "Letters Commendatory," "Testimonials"
Licensing Laws, Royal Commission on, (*f*) 66
— of Clergy. *See* "Missionaries, Relations of, to Bishops"
Lichfield, Bishop Selwyn of, (*N*) 10, 12, 14, 15, 18; (*a*) 78
Lincoln, Bishop King of, (*N*) 40
Lincoln, Bishop Wordsworth of, (*N*) 24, 38
Liquor Traffic. *See* "Native Races and demoralising influences"
Litany, Revision of, (*e*) 384. *See* "Prayer Book"
Literature bearing on International Arbitration, (*d*) 263
Liturgical Variations. *See* "Prayer-Book, revision and adaptation of"
Living Wage, (*f*) 70–71, 74
London, Bishop Winnington-Ingram of (*f*) 139, 147
London House, Committees held at, (*N*) 36
Longley, Archbishop, (*N*) 4, 7, 8, 14, 16, 34
Lord's Day. *See* "Sunday"
— Prayer, repetition of, (*e*) 384
Lusitanian Church, (*e*) 427
Lycurgus, Archbishop, (*c*) 167

M

Macaulay, Lord, Description of the Church by, (*d*) 248
Maclagan, Archbishop of York, (*N*) 40; (*d*) 244
Magnusson, Peter, (*d*) 257
Maistre, Count Joseph de, Description of the Church by, (*d*) 248
Malabar, Christians of St. Thomas in, (*f*) 151

INDEX

Mansion House Dinner, (*N*) 46*k*
Manual of Doctrine, A, (*c*) 174. *See also* "Declaration," "Standards"
Maoris, (*d*) 232
Mariaviten Church, (*f*) 154
Mar Ignatius Abdullah, Patriarch, (*f*) 150
Marriage, Laws and Sanctity of, (*b*) 94, 96; (*c*) 108, 131; (*d*) 184; (*e*) 309, 323, 326, 327, 374, 375, 395–408; (*f*) 17–18, 36, 44–45, 88–90, 107–115
Marriage Problems. *See* "Marriage, Laws and Sanctity of." *See also* "Divorce," "Polygamy," "Purity"
Mar Shimun, Patriarch Benjamin, (*f*) 149
"Masih," use of word, (*e*) 382
Mason, Canon, (*N*) 46*g*
Massachusetts, Bishop Lawrence of, Note by, on Holy Orders, (*e*) 361
Massingberd, Rev. Chancellor, Resolution on unity by, (*c*) 156
Mathew, Rev. A. H., (*f*) 33–34, 154–155
Medd, Canon, Resolution on unity by, (*c*) 157
Melanesia, Native churches in, (*d*) 232, 235
Memorials presented to Conferences, (*N*) 23, 36
"Message to Men and Women of Goodwill," (*N*) 46*n*
Metropolitans, Election of, (*f*) 79
— Jurisdiction of, (*a*) 56, 66, 70; (*d*) 197. *See also* "Appeal"
— Trial of, (*a*) 66
Mexico, Church in, (*b*) 93; (*d*) 194, 204, 241
Ministries of Healing, (*e*) 308, 325, 390–395; (*f*) 15, 122, 125
Ministry, Candidates for the. *See* "Clergy"
Ministry of Women, (*N*) 46*h*; (*f*) 14–15, 39–41, 95–106
"Ministry of Women, The" report, (*f*) 101, 102. *See also* "Deaconesses," "Communities, Religious," "Women Missionaries"
Minnesota, Bishop Whipple of, (*N*) 34, 37
Miracles, Truth of, (*e*) 342
Mirfield, College of the Resurrection, (*e*) 350
Missionaries, German, (*f*) 91
Missionaries, Medical, (*d*) 224, 226, 228
— Personal requirements of, (*d*) 226, 227
— Relation of, to Bishops, (*N*) 18, 22; (*a*) 72; (*b*) 89–92; (*d*) 239
Missionary Agencies, correlation of, (*e*) 378–381; (*f*) 35
— — finances of, (*f*) 85–86
— — indispensability of, (*f*) 86–87
— Bishoprics, (*a*) 56, 71–73; (*b*) 90–92; (*e*) 381; (*f*) 83
— Bishops and Clergy, Relation of to Missionary Societies, (*b*) 92; (*d*) 198, 204, 237–239; (*e*) 378
— Colleges, (*d*) 239, 278
Missionary work and young Clergy. *See* "Clergy, younger, Service abroad of"
— zeal, (*d*) 201, 222, 238; (*e*) 298
Missions, Board of Reference for, (*b*) 94, 97
— Day of Intercession for, (*b*) 86; (*d*) 223
— Foreign, (*d*) 194–198, 201–204, 222–239; (*e*) 306, 322, 372–382; (*f*) 20–22, 35–37, 81–94. *See also* "Colonies," "Native Races"
— Government relations to, (*f*) 37, 91–94
— Medical, (*d*) 228; (*e*) 298
— Revival of, (*d*) 194, 223; (*e*) 298
— Sporadic and unsystematised, (*d*) 226
Missouri, Bishop Tuttle of, (*N*) 34, 45, 46*a*
Mitchinson, Bishop, (*f*) 159
Mohammedanism in Africa, (*d*) 229, 231; (*e*) 373
— Arabia, (*d*) 230
— Asia, (*d*) 229, 230
— Australasia, (*d*) 229
— British Empire, (*d*) 229
— Constantinople, (*d*) 230
— Egypt, (*d*) 230
— Europe, (*d*) 229
— Hausa District, (*d*) 202, 231
— India, (*d*) 196, 202, 223, 230, 231
— Palestine, (*d*) 230
— Persia, (*d*) 230
Mohammedans and Mohammedanism, (*d*) 195–196, 201, 223, 225, 229–232; (*e*) 373
Moltke, General, Definition of war by, (*d*) 259

INDEX

Monophysite heresy, (*e*) 425; (*f*) 150–151
Montgomery, Bishop, (*N*) 46*b*
Montreal, Bishop Fulford of, (*N*) 11, 12
Montreal, Synod of, (*c*) 157
Moral witness of the Church, (*e*) 311, 327–329, 409–415; (*f*) 75
Moravian Church, The, (*b*) 93, 95; (*c*) 123, 166; (*d*) 193, 206, 251; (*e*) 316, 334, 335, 420, 422, 427–428; (*f*) 34, 156–159
Morphia, (*f*) 26, 55
Morton's Tower, (*N*) 46*i*
Moscow, Metropolitan of, (*a*) 76
Mott Williams, Bishop, (*f*) 152
Mumford, Bishop, (*f*) 158
Mutual Relations of Dioceses, (*c*) 112, 121, 149–155

N

Name of Our Lord, Translation of, (*e*) 382
Natal, Diocese of, (*N*) 7, 10, 11, 12; (*a*) 55, 73–75, 76
National Assembly, (*f*) 83, 84, 101
"National Church of Sweden" (Hale Lectures), (*f*) 152, 153
National Saints, Insertion of, in Calendar, (*e*) 385
Native Churches and foreign customs, (*d*) 202, 227; (*e*) 375
— — and unity, (*d*) 202, 203
— — Establishment and development of, (*d*) 196, 202, 232–237; (*e*) 321, 376, 377; (*f*) 85–87
— — Independence of, (*d*) 197, 202; (*e*) 321, 373, 376
— races and demoralising influences, (*c*) 128; (*d*) 193, 203, 210, 235; (*e*) 312, 328
— — justice to, (*f*) 26, 56, 63
Neo-Platonists, (*f*) 118
Nestorian heresy, (*e*) 425
Nestorians, (*f*) 149
New Guinea, Mission to, (*d*) 235
New Zealand, Bishop Selwyn of, (*N*) 10, 12, 14, 15, 18; (*a*) 78
New Zealand, Dominion of, (*f*) 66
— — Synod of, (*c*) 157; (*d*) 284. *See also* "Maoris"
Nicæa, Council of, (*c*) 168, 172
Nicene Creed, (*N*) 46*h*; (*c*) 122, 124, 158, 159, 168, 171, 172; (*d*) 247, 248; (*e*) 387; (*f*) 28, 148
Nigeria, Diocese of, (*f*) 83
Nippon Sei Ko Kwai, (*d*) 235; (*e*) 377, 379, 380; (*f*) 83
Nonconformist bodies. *See* "Unity, Church"
Non-episcopal Churches. *See* "Unity, Church"
Norway. *See* "Scandinavian Church"
Number of Bishops attending Conferences (*N*) 30. *See also* "Lambeth Conferences, numbers attending"

O

Obedience, canonical, (*d*) 187, 200; (*f*) 79
— to Archbishop of Canterbury, (*b*) 101; (*d*) 187, 200, 214; (*e*) 418
Occasional Prayers and Thanksgivings, Enrichment of, (*e*) 384
Œcumenical Councils, (*c*) 116, 171, 172
— Patriarchate, (*f*) 11, 32, 147
Old Catholics, The, (*b*) 93; (*c*) 115, 123, 162–165; (*d*) 194, 204, 240; (*e*) 334, 422, 427; (*f*) 33–34, 152, 154–156
Oldham, Mr. J. H., (*f*) 94
Ontario, Bishop of, (*N*) 4
Opium, (*e*) 312, 328; (*f*) 55, 93
Ordination, Age for, (*e*) 352
— Candidates Council, (*e*) 351, 352
— Candidates Fund, (*e*) 319, 352, 360
— Conditional, (*f*) 155
— in Non-episcopal Churches, (*e*) 431, 434–439; (*f*) 29, 141–143
— in Swedish Church, (*d*) 206, 252–257; (*e*) 429–430
Organisation of the Anglican Communion. *See* "Anglican Communion"
Ornaments Rubric, (*e*) 385
Orthodox Eastern Church. *See* "Eastern Churches"

P

Pagonis, Archmandrite, (*f*) 147
Palestine, Educational work in, (*d*) 230
Pan Anglican Congress, (*e*) 299, 306, 323
Panchayats, (*e*) 376

Parents and religious instruction, (*e*) 305, 321, 350, 353, 371
Pastoral Letters. *See* "Encyclical"
Peace. *See* "Arbitration, International"
Peace Conference, (*f*) 94
— Societies, (*d*) 260
Pennsylvania, Bishop Stevens of, (*N*) 25
Penzance, Lord, member of Council of Reference, (*c*) 151
Permanent Diaconate. *See* "Diaconate"
Perry, Bishop Stevens, (*N*) 24
Persia, Pioneer work in, (*d*) 230
Peterborough, Bishop Woods of, (*N*) 46*b*, 46*i*, 46*n*
— Cathedral, (*N*) 46*k*
Peterson, Archbishop. *See* "Upsala"
Petitions to Conference, (*N*) 23, 36
Philarete, Eminence, (*a*) 76
Pilgrims of Prayer, (*f*) 100
Pittsburgh, Bishop Kerfoot of, (*N*) 15
Poland, Mariaviten Church in, (*f*) 154
Polygamy, (*c*) 108, 120, 133–135; (*e*) 374; (*f*) 89–90
Poor, Care of the. *See* "Industrial Problems"
Port of London, Emigrant work at, (*c*) 144
Portugal, Reformation Movement in. *See* "Spain"
Position of Women. *See* "Ministry of Women"
Prayer, (*f*) 17, 42
Prayer, Book of Common, (*a*) 56; (*b*) 89–90, 94; (*c*) 117, 154, 173; (*d*) 194, 229, 271–275; (*e*) 322, 323, 336, 374, 382–387, 388
— — — — as standard of doctrine, (*c*) 173; (*d*) 189; (*e*) 322, 374; (*f*) 30, 36. *See also* "Standards, Authoritative"
— — — — Revision of, and adaptation of services, (*a*) 56, 61; (*c*) 121, 147, 152, 173–174; (*d*) 190, 207, 208, 271–275; (*e*) 307, 315, 322–325, 374, 382–387, 388, 394; (*f*) 36, 87–88
Prayer, Forms of, (*d*) 274
Precedence, Order of, (*N*) 35
Presbyterian and other non-episcopal Churches (*e*), 431–439; (*f*) 140. *See also* "Unity, Church"
Press Association, (*N*) 46*n*
Preventive and Rescue Work, (*f*) 45, 113, 115
"Problem of Reunion, The," (*f*) 144
Prohibited Degrees. *See* "Marriage Problems"
Prohibition, (*f*) 66
Proudhon, Definition of Socialism by, (*c*) 136
Provinces, Formation of, (*a*) 70; (*b*) 84, 101; (*d*) 187; (*e*) 415, 416; (*f*) 13, 37–38, 78–80
Provincial organisation (*a*) 70; (*b*) 84, 88, 101; (*d*) 200, 214, 234; (*f*) 78, 79
— Synods. *See* "Synods"
Psalter, (*e*) 386
Publications to promote unity, (*d*) 245
Public Morality Council, (*f*) 115
Public Responsibility, The principle of, (*d*) 267
Puller, Rev. Fr., (*f*) 94
Purity, (*c*) 107, 119, 130–132; (*d*) 183; (*f*) 65

Q

Queen, H.M. the, Address to, (*N*) 37
— Reception of Bishops by, (*N*) 41
Queen Victoria Clergy Fund, (*e*) 360
Quicunque vult, (*c*) 124, 172; (*d*) 208, 274; (*e*) 307, 315, 324, 387; (*f*) 149
Quiet Days, (*f*) 106

R

Racial Problems, (*e*) 376–378; (*f*) 79
Readers, Historical. *See* "Church History"
Records of Conferences, The MS., (*N*) 23, 35, 46*l*; (*a*) 76
Recruiting Campaign, (*f*) 77, 84
Reformation Movements, (*b*) 93, 94; (*c*) 115, 123, 124, 162–165; (*d*) 194, 204, 205, 240–243; (*f*) 34, 159–161. *See also* "Brazil," "France," "Italy," "Portugal," "Spain"
Reformed Episcopal Church. *See* "Reformation Movements"
Reinkens, Bishop, (*c*) 163

Relation of Religious Communities to the Episcopate. *See* "Communities"
Religious Communities. *See* "Communities"
— Education, (*c*) 110, 111; (*e*) 304, 320, 367–372; (*f*) 69
Resolutions, Communication of, to other Churches, (*d*) 199
— formally adopted. *See* "Lambeth Conferences, Resolutions of"
Responsibility, The principle of public, (*d*) 267
Restriction on population. *See* "Marriage Problems" and "Birth Control"
Retreats, (*f*) 106
Reunion. *See* "Unity, Church"
Revelation and Science, Relations between, (*c*) 111; (*e*) 302, 339–340
Richborough Castle, Visit of Bishops to, (*N*) 40
Ritual, (*b*) 86, 94, 97
Robinson, Dean Armitage, (*N*) 44
Roman Catholics, Marriages with, (*e*) 333, 426. *See also* "Latin Communion"
Rome, Errors of Church of, (*a*) 50; (*b*) 93, 94–95; (*c*) 116, 159, 162, 163, 168; (*d*) 205; (*e*) 427
— and Reformation Movements, (*d*) 194, 205
— Reunion with Church of, (*c*) 115, 159, 168; (*d*) 246; (*e*) 380, 422, 426; (*f*) 144. *See also* "Latin Communion"
Rubrics. *See* "Prayer-Book, Revision of"
Rupertsland, Synod of, (*c*) 157
Russell, Mr. Bertrand, (*f*) 72
Russian Church, (*a*) 76; (*d*) 205, 244, 245; (*e*) 380, 422, 423; (*f*) 32, 145–146
— — National Council of the, (*e*) 332, 424. *See also* "Eastern Churches"
Russo-Greek Committee of the American Church, (*d*) 245
Ryle, Bishop, (*N*) 46*g*; (*f*) 101, 152

S

Sailors' Homes, (*d*) 210
St. Andrew, Brotherhood of, (*e*) 298
St. Andrew's Waterside Mission, (*c*) 144
St. Augustine on miracles, (*e*) 342
St. Augustine's Chair, (*N*) 20, 31, 43, 46*c*
St. Augustine's College, (*N*) 20, 30, 41, 43, 46*g*; (*d*) 278
St. Martin's Church, (*N*) 41, 43, 46*g*
St. Paul's Cathedral, Services in, (*N*) 25, 37, 42, 45, 46*m*
St. Thomas Becket, (*N*) 46*g*
Salisbury, Bishop Wordsworth of, (*N*) 38; (*f*) 150, 152
Salisbury Cathedral, (*N*) 46*k*
Salisbury, Lord, on Arbitration, (*d*) 261
Scandinavian Church, The, (*c*) 114, 123, 161–162; (*d*) 193, 206, 252–257; (*e*) 315, 335, 422, 428–431; (*f*) 33, 152–154
Schäffle, Definition of Socialism by, (*c*) 137
Science and Revelation, Relations between, (*c*) 111; (*e*) 302, 339–340
Scotland, Episcopal Church in, (*a*) 64; (*b*) 95, 97; (*e*) 402, 416
— Established Church of, (*d*) 249
Scriptures, The Holy. *See* "Bible"
Seamen, Spiritual needs of, (*d*) 210
Secretaries of Conferences, (*N*) 8, 12, 13, 23, 28, 35, 38, 46*b*; (*a*) 76
Seeley, Sir John, on stability of the Empire, (*d*) 276
Sees, Establishment of new, (*a*) 54, 61; (*b*) 84; (*d*) 197, 203, 209, 237, 280; (*e*) 381; (*f*) 37, 79, 137. *See also* "Bishops"
Selwyn, Bishop, (*N*) 10, 12, 14, 15, 18; (*a*) 78
Separated Churches of the East. *See* "Eastern Churches"
Serbian Church, (*f*) 146
Sermons and Addresses, (*N*) 8, 12, 20, 22, 25, 31, 33, 34, 38, 40, 42, 43, 45, 46*c*, 46*g*, 46*m*
Service abroad of younger Clergy. *See* "Clergy," "Colonies, Duties of Church to"
Service Candidates for the Ministry, (*f*) 75
"Service," Church ordained for, (*e*) 296–298, 300
Service of Welcome. *See* "Canterbury Cathedral"
Services, Additional forms of. *See* "Prayer Book"

Sexual Morality, (*f*) 44–45, 107–115. *See also* "Marriage, Laws and Sanctity of"
Shanghai, Conference at, (*d*) 236
— Training School in, (*b*) 85
Shortened forms of services. *See* "Prayer Book, revision of"
Sick, Administration of Communion to the, (*d*) 190, 208
— Anointing of the, (*e*) 309, 325, 326, 391, 394; (*f*) 43
— Office for visitation of the, (*e*) 325, 394; (*f*) 125
Sidgwick, Mrs. Henry, (*f*) 119
Sisterhoods and Brotherhoods. *See* "Communities"
Skat Rørdam, Bishop, (*e*) 431
Slavery, abolition of, (*d*) 231
Smith, Ven. B. F., (*N*) 35
Smuts, General, (*f*) 64
Social and Industrial Questions. *See* "Industrial Problems"
Social Service, Guilds of, (*d*) 268, 270; (*e*) 299, 328, 411; (*f*) 75, 76
— — Union, (*e*) 415
Socialism, (*c*) 109, 121, 136–141; (*e*) 413–415; (*f*) 46
— Definitions of, (*c*) 136, 137. *See also* "Democratic movement," "Industrial Problems"
Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, (*N*) 38, 46*k*; (*b*) 85; (*c*) 144, 145, 147; (*d*) 238, 276, 280; (*f*) 130
Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (*N*) 46*k*, (*d*) 238, 277; (*e*) 360
Society of Psychical Research, (*f*) 118–119
Sorbonne, Doctors of the, (*c*) 165
South Africa, Church of the Province of, (*N*) 3; (*a*) 55, 73; (*e*) 377, 404, 418
— — Labour problems in, (*f*) 63–64
South India United Church, (*f*) 140
South Pacific Islands. *See* "Melanesia"
Spain and Portugal, Reformation movement in, (*b*) 93; (*c*) 123, 165; (*d*) 194, 205, 241, 242; (*e*) 427
Spiritual Healing. *See* "Ministries of Healing"
Spiritualism, (*f*) 15–16, 41–42, 116–122
Spiritual Tribunal. *See* "Appeal, Central Court of"
Standards, Authoritative, (*N*) 9, 16; (*a*) 53, 56, 64; (*b*) 83, 87, 94, 97; (*c*) 116, 122, 124, 153–155, 158, 159, 170–175; (*d*) 188, 189, 191, 219, 247, 248; (*e*) 301, 318, 322, 343, 374, 380; (*f*) 28
Stanley, Dean, (*N*) 12
Stanton, Rev. Dr. Weitbrecht, (*f*) 94
Status of Ministers, (*f*) 143
Stevens, Bishop, (*N*) 25
Stone, Rev. Dr. Darwell, (*f*) 94
Student Christian Movement, (*f*) 58
— Volunteer Missionary Union, (*d*) 224; (*e*) 298, 371
Students, Spiritual life of, (*e*) 321
Study Circles, (*f*) 76
Summer School of Theology, (*f*) 144
Sunday, Observance of, (*c*) 109, 120, 135–136; (*e*) 311, 329
— Schools, (*c*) 111; (*e*) 315, 320, 369
Supply and Training of Clergy. *See* "Clergy"
Swedish Church. *See* "Scandinavian Church"
Switzerland. *See* "Old Catholics"
— Christian Catholic Church in, (*c*) 123, 164; (*d*) 194, 204, 241; (*e*) 334, 427
Synods, Authority of, (*a*) 68–69; (*f*) 143
— Character and subordination of, (*N*) 10; (*a*) 54–56, 58–62; (*f*) 79, 86, 137
Syrian Jacobites, (*e*) 425; (*f*) 149–150

T

Tait, Archbishop, (*N*) 14, 15, 17, 19, 20, 25, 27, 31, 34, 35; (*c*) 170
— Rev. Craufurd, (*N*) 20, 21
Talbot, Mr. J. G., (*N*) 26, 38
Tali, Use of, (*e*) 375
Tallents, Mr. G. W., (*N*) 38
Teachers, Religious training of, (*c*) 111; (*e*) 321, 370
Temperance, (*c*) 107, 119, 125–129, 144; (*d*) 183; (*f*) 47, 65–67
Temple, Archbishop, (*N*) 40, 42; (*e*) 416, 440; (*f*) 66
Tennessee, Bishop Gailor of, (*N*) 46*a*, 46*m*
Testimonials, (*a*) 72; (*b*) 84; (*c*) 113, 149; (*e*) 320. *See also* "Letters Commendatory"
Theological examinations, (*d*) 210, 284; (*e*) 353–355. *See also* "Degrees in Divinity"

Theological study, Encouragement of, (*d*) 191, 210, 255, 256; (*e*) 353–355; (*f*) 43
Theosophical Society. *See* "Theosophy"
Theosophy, (*f*) 15–16, 41, 43, 116–118, 125–130
Thirlwall, Bishop, (*N*) 7
Thirty-nine Articles, (*b*) 100; (*c*) 117, 124, 154, 173–174; (*f*) 148
Thomson, Archbishop of York, (*N*) 7, 22, 38
Tottie, Bishop. *See* "Kalmar, Bishop of"
Tozer, Bishop, (*a*) 72
Trade, Wrong forms of, (*e*) 328. *See also* "Native Races and demoralising influences"
Trade-unions, (*f*) 10, 69
Translations of Anglican and Eastern Liturgies, (*d*) 245
— — Encyclical Letters. *See* "Versions," "Wordsworth"
Tribunal of Appeal. *See* "Appeal"
— — Reference. *See* "Appeal"
Trondhjem, Archbishop of, (*d*) 257
Tuttle, Bishop, (*N*) 34, 45, 46*a*

U

Uganda, Church in, (*d*) 234; (*e*) 389; (*f*) 83
Unction of the Sick. *See* "Sick, Anointing of the"
Unemployed, The, (*d*) 268–270; (*f*) 70
— — Solution of difficulties of, (*d*) 269
Unfermented "wine," (*c*) 107, 119; (*e*) 308, 324, 389
Uniformity, Acts of, (*d*) 272, 273
Uniform Kalendar, (*f*) 148
Union, Maintenance of. *See* "Unity, Church"
Unitas Fratrum. *See* "Moravians"
United States of America, (*f*) 47, 55, 57, 66, 75, 76, 80
United States, Protestant Episcopal Church in the. *See* "American Church"
Unity, Church, (*N*) 5, 9, 10, 18, 21, 46*h*, 46*m*; (*a*) 53–56; (*b*) 82–87; (*c*) 113, 122–124, 156–161; (*d*) 187, 193, 197, 200, 202–206, 213, 243–257; (*e*) 313, 321, 322, 331–333, 334, 336, 380, 420–439; (*f*) 11–13, 26–35, 131–161
Unity of Christendom, prayer for the, (*b*) 86; (*c*) 156, 161; (*d*) 193
University Student Volunteer movement, (*e*) 371
— training. *See* "Clergy, Supply and training of"
Upsala, Archbishop of, (*d*) 255, 257; (*e*) 315, 335, 429; (*f*) 152
— Conference at, in 1909, (*f*) 153
Utrecht, Archbishop of, (*d*) 242; (*f*) 154

V

Velimirovic, Fr. Nicholai, (*f*) 146
Versions of Encyclical Letters, (*N*) 24, 38, 46*n*
Vienna, International Congress in, (*d*) 205
Voluntary Boards of Arbitration. *See* "Arbitration"
— Spiritual Tribunal. *See* "Appeal, Central Court of"

W

Wake, Archbishop, (*c*) 165
War, The Great, (*N*) 46*a*, 46*f*; (*f*) 9–11, 16, 20, 21, 25, 32, 45, 51, 53, 58, 59–60, 146, 149, 154
— Horrors of, (*d*) 258; (*f*) 32
— Writers on moral principles involved in, (*d*) 262. *See also* "Arbitration, International"
Washington Conference, (*f*) 57
Watkins, Rev. O. D., (*f*) 94
Weber, Bishop, (*d*) 240
Wesleyan Church, (*f*) 139. *See also* "Unity, Church"
Westcott, Most Rev. F., (*N*) 46*m*
Westcott, late Bishop of Durham, (*f*) 61, 71
Westeras, Bishop of, (*d*) 257
Western New York, Bishop Cleveland Coxe of, (*N*) 20, 33
West Indian Dioceses, (*b*) 93, 95–96; (*c*) 151
Westminster Abbey, Services in, (*N*) 12, 33, 40, 43, 46*g*; (*d*) 182; (*e*) 294
West, Separate Churches of the, (*e*) 427
West Syrians. *See* "Syrian Jacobites"
Whipple, Bishop, (*N*) 34, 37
Whitehouse, Bishop, (*N*) 6, 8; (*a*) 77
White Slave Traffic, (*f*) 55
"Wine," unfermented, (*c*) 107, 119, (*e*) 308, 324, 389

Women in Industry, (*f*) 64–65
— Messengers, (*f*) 100
— Missionaries, (*d*) 224, 226; (*f*) 87
— Police, (*f*) 113
— Position of. *See* "Ministry of Women"
Wordsworth, Bishop Christopher of Lincoln, (*N*) 24, 38
— Bishop John of Salisbury, (*N*) 38; (*f*) 150, 152
Work as first duty of the Christian, (*e*) 413
Workers' Educational Association, (*f*) 69
World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship, (*f*) 57
World Conference on Faith and Order, (*f*) 11, 32, 139
Worship and Work, relation between, (*c*) 111
— Diversities in, (*b*) 86–87. *See also* "Ritual," "Standards"
Wright, Mr. Philip, (*N*) 13; (*a*) 77
Wu Lien-Teh, Dr., article *re* Narcotics by, (*f*) 55

Y

York, Archbishop Lang of, (*N*) 46*l*
York, Archbishop Maclagan of, (*N*) 40; (*d*) 244
York, Archbishop Thomson of, (*N*) 7, 22, 38
Younger Clergy, Service abroad of. *See* "Clergy"
Young Men's Christian Association, (*f*) 139

Z

Zicha, Bishop of, (*f*) 146

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY RICHARD CLAY & SONS, LIMITED,
BUNGAY, SUFFOLK.